

The date on which your subscription expires will be found in the wrapper.
The paper will be stopped on that day unless previously renewed.

WEEKLY PEOPLE.

Agents sending in subscriptions without remittance must state distinctly how they are to be paid.
Agents are personally charged with and held responsible for unpaid subscriptions sent in by them.

VOL. X. NO. 37

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1900.

PRICE 2 CENTS.

DEBATE ON TRADE UNIONISM

Held at the Grand Opera House,
New Haven, Connecticut,

November 25, 1900,

BETWEEN

DANIEL DE LEON,

REPRESENTING THE SOCIALIST TRADE AND LABOR
ALLIANCE,

— AND —

JOB HARRIMAN,

REPRESENTING OLD STYLE OR PURE AND SIMPLE
TRADE UNIONISM.

Copyright, 1900, by the New York Labor News Company.

On taking the chair, Mr. Wm. E. Clegg, of Yale University, announced the subject and distribution of time as follows:

The question is, **“SOLVED, THAT THE TACTICS OF THE SOCIALIST TRADE AND LABOR ALLIANCE AGAINST THE PURE AND SIMPLE TRADES UNION IS FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE WORKING CLASS AND FOR THE PROMOTION OF SOCIALISM IN AMERICA.”** The time of the debate will be divided as follows: for the presentation of their arguments the gentlemen will have thirty minutes each; for rebuttal, Mr. Daniel De Leon of the Socialist Labor Party, will have twenty minutes; Mr. Harriman of the Social Democratic Party, thirty minutes; Mr. De Leon closing the speech in a ten minute period. At the five minutes before the expiration of the thirty and twenty minute periods one stroke of the gavel will signify that the gentlemen have five minutes to complete their periods. At the end of nine minutes, during the ten minute period one stroke of the gavel will be given. The first speaker of the evening will be Mr. Daniel De Leon.

DE LEON:

Working men and working women of New Haven: The question that is to be presented to you here to-night is, in my opinion, a pivotal question—the trades union question—a question that is blocking the way to progress, and the correct solution of which is essential to the interests of the working class and of the Socialist movement of the land. It is a question that has to be approached deliberately and calmly. I come not to win a victory. There is no such question here in my mind as to whether I or any one else wins a snap victory at this meeting. I propose to speak to you deliberately. It is a question of facts and close reasoning. It is a question, the facts concerning which you will have to take home with you and consider there. It is not a question as to what man wins, but a question whether our common country shall win, and whether this trade union question can be at all solved.

The trades union policy of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance involves the trade union policy of the Socialists organized in the Socialist Labor Party. That policy was not evolved out of the inner consciousness of any one man or set of men. It is a policy that is based upon certain facts, certain historic facts, certain undeniable facts, and established upon conclusions that are not escapable from. In choosing these facts, I have been careful to take only such as are over and above dispute. Only children wrangle over facts; men agree upon them. Now, I do not suppose that this meeting has come here to witness a “washing of dirty linen” with mutual criminations and recriminations. The facts I shall present to you are facts known to be facts, or, if they are not known to be such by my audience, my audience can easily verify them, because they are all taken from the official organs of the very organizations against whom we stand arrayed.

The first principle upon which the Socialists stand is this: that the permanent improvement of the working class, let alone their emancipation, is impossible, unless they obtain absolute control of the government and thereby turn this capitalist system into the Socialist Republic. That is a fundamental principle with us.

The second principle is this: the conquest of the public powers by the S. L. P. is an impossibility over-night. It will take at least four years from the time that the workingmen commence to march actually and intelligently towards their emancipation. It may take ten, it may take twenty years. In the meantime what shall be done? Something is wanted NOW. Some economic relief is demanded now. The political organization can only come into play once a year. In this State only once every two years. At any rate, it can come into play only occasionally. The workingmen need something else besides. They need an organization that may give some relief, however temporary. No intelligent physician will attend a serious sickness, overlooking entirely the palliatives that he might give his patient. However much an economic organization may give palliatives only, however entirely these things may be palliatives, they are something; it is a relief and the workingmen need it, and need it badly. Now then, the only organization that can give that temporary relief is the economic organization, the trades union. Accordingly, the S. L. P. builds upon this second principle: that the trades union which can do good to the working men must be a trades union which has a certain central character; it must recognize the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class. The trade union that doesn't recognize that much, so that it may be kept from entanglements that the conflicting interests of their competing employers might bring them into, a trades union that doesn't recognize the class struggle will find itself arrayed against other workingmen of different trades, sometimes of their own trade, according to the temporary interests of their employer. A workingmen's organization that is not a trades union, a workingmen's organization that imagines that the interests of the capitalist class and the interests of the working class are one and the same—such an organization and such workingmen are simply appendages to the capitalist class, and will be drawn into the vortex of competing capitalist conflicts. (Applause.) Don't take

away my time. That is the second principle. We must have an economic organization and we must have a political organization. We see in Germany a magnificent political movement, substantially a workingmen's movement, and yet the condition of the workingmen declines steadily. Why? Because there is no economic organization worth mentioning. In the United States we see a big, substantially big, trades union movement, and yet the condition of the workingmen goes down steadily. Why? Because here the political movement is insignificant. In France, where the political movement is strong and the trades union, intelligent trades union, is strong, there we can with justice say that large areas of the workingmen have been improved, while the struggle is going on. We need an economic organization accordingly, that moves under the protecting flag of a labor political party.

Now then, arrived so far, the question is, Are there such trade unions in existence? If you want a thing and you find something in the way that calls itself what you are looking for, you are not going to build one; you will try to get along with it, if possible. Working in this direction, the Socialists, organized in the Socialist Labor Party, came across a movement that was said to be a trades union movement. It came across organizations of working men. Now the present policy of the Socialists in the Socialist Labor Party is dictated by these two principles that I have just mentioned, plus the experience made with the existing unions that we found, and right here a short sketch of those unions will be necessary.

We found organizations of workingmen, but we found that they were marked with exactly the reverse of the central characteristic that was necessary for a workingmen's organization. Instead of being class-conscious, they built upon the principle of the brotherhood of the workingman and the capitalist. As a result of that, they moved for higher wages, and right after that they gave up whatever they had gained. They were torn apart themselves by the interests of the capitalist class. At that time these trade unions, guided by a natural instinct, and yet by an untutored instinct, moved in a peculiar way. The giant was blind. He struck in the air, and sometimes his blows fell upon individual capitalists. The capitalist class then proceeded to endeavor to control the trade union, and a struggle took place within the unions. On the one side were the Socialists; the other the capitalists. Socialists and representatives of the capitalists found themselves within the trade unions, struggling each of them to get control of that organization—the Socialists trying to get control of that organization for the working men; the representatives of the capitalists trying to get control of that organization for the capitalist class. The result of it was that the Socialists were beaten.

In that struggle, the Socialist movement being weak, the Socialists went under, and presently the trades union movement became in the country an engine of the capitalist, controlled by the capitalist through what Mark Hanna has just called the “labor lieutenants” of the capitalist class. These men, who are the officers of the unions, and whom we have termed labor fakirs, or the Organized Scabbery of the union—these labor fakirs, this Organized Scabbery, these labor lieutenants of the capitalists in the unions have controlled the union absolutely in the economic interests of the capitalist class, and obedient to the dictates of the capitalists.

We have seen for instance in New York, it is an open secret, that the recent trolley strike was a stock exchange strike, dictated by the magnates who wanted to force down the price of stock so as to buy in cheaply, and that strike was ordered by these men, and carried out by their labor lieutenants. We saw the strike of the miners in Pennsylvania ordered by the United Mine Workers against Dr. Armit, and the rank and file were forced into that battle and sacrificed as fool for cannon, not obedient to the interests of the working men, but obedient to the interests of the capitalists, who gave the orders to their labor lieutenants, the labor fakirs in the unions.

We saw more. We saw that every time the revolutionary pulse was felt within the unions, and the rank and file wanted something, the capitalist influence was felt potent within the union. Through his labor lieutenants, the capitalist managed to still that pulse, and operating his labor lieutenants like lightning rods, he ran the revolutionary lightning into the ground. We have seen, for instance, when the miners of Alabama, wanting to wring better conditions from their employers, elected upon a revolutionary program their delegates to the convention, that the mine operators ordered their labor lieutenants, the Miners' Union's officers, to somehow or other annul those elections and start new elections; that this new order was carried out, and that another convention was thus chosen agreeable to the employers, instead of what it was at first. We have seen for instance that when miners at Hazleton felt indignant at being shot by the sheriffs of capitalism, it was again a lieutenant of labor, Mr. Fahy, whom the capitalists gave free tickets to reach the place, churches and halls to speak in, and who there addressed the men, saying that these employers were good men, that it was a mistake, that it was not meant, and that they should stop hating their employers, they should go back to work and forget the butcheries.

I will not mention more illustrations. These will do. Such a trade union movement, whatever it was, was no longer a movement of the working class, any more than an army that consists of working men is a workingmen's army if it is manned and officered by the representatives of the capitalist class.

With that experience the Socialists said, something has to be done with these organizations, which are carrying the working men down to destruction, these organizations which are controlled by the lieutenants of the capitalist class, where every pulse of the revolutionary feeling among the rank and file is deadened, and where the men are made to more obedient to the interests and the dictates of the capitalists.

When we moved in that direction, we came across two theories. One set of men said to us: “Why, give it up; don't bother with the union.” These were usually the “intellectuals.” They said: “The union is rotten; it is a vanishing thing.” “No,” said we, “it is not a vanishing thing; it is a rotten thing, but the skeleton remains.” It is with these unions, as with the seals in the Probylof Islands. The seal-catchers don't go out in pursuit of the seals. They know that at certain seasons the seals gather of themselves at certain spots. At such seasons the hunters are ready at the given places, club in hand; and when the seals turn up, hit them over the head and control of those skeletons of trade unions. They wait for the season when the working men, moved by a revolutionary impulse, demand higher wages and better times. Then come these labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, and with their capitalist clubs, hit this revolutionary movement over the head, by leading it into the ground, like the lightning rod does with the lightning. The theory of “dropping” the union would not do.

The other theory suggested was: “Bore from within.” And we tried it. We went into the unions and bored from within. We tried to teach the class struggle. One division, in which I was active myself, was in the K. of L. of G. We struggled and we struggled with the labor lieutenants of the capitalists; it came to hand to hand encounters; finally, we landed on the outside.

While this was the experience or fate of one division of “Borers from Within” the experience and fate of another division, the division that opposes us to-day, was this: By little and little their voices were extinguished. An illustration of that is found in the Progressive Union of Cigar-makers No. 90 of New York. It was said to be the Socialist Union par excellence in the land. It went into the International Union; it was going to bore from within. It was going to teach Socialism. By little and little there was less and less of its voice heard. To-day even within its own organization, Republican heeled are elected to represent it, and they dare not remove them—(Applause)—and as far as their national organization is concerned, not a voice is heard on the part of the borers from within against the economic and other outrages that are being committed.

“Boring from within” resolved itself accordingly, into this: either you must bore to a purpose, and then you land quickly on the outside; or you don't land on the outside, but you knuckle under, a silent supporter of the felonies committed by the labor lieutenants of capitalism. Such was the experience.

In Wisconsin there was a strike of the wood carvers in the McMillan shop. One of the benchmen of that shop clubbed one of the strikers and killed him. The revolutionary pulse was felt throughout the land. What became of it? One of the vice-presidents of the A. F. of L., the National Secretary of these very woodworkers, called the strikers together, and says: “Men, be cool, be calm; McMillan is a good employer, be as a kind man; forget what has happened.” This is of record in his own journal—cannot be denied.

See what happened with the boiler makers. There was in the Senate of the U. S. a bill for the eight hour day by the A. F. of L. Senator Elkins kills that bill, speaks and votes against it. Thereupon the boiler makers go about and make speeches for Elkins, calling him a good employer. Why? Because he had a ship subsidy bill that would throw some jobs into their hands. Obey Elkins, that branch of the A. F. of L. stood up against the rest of them. For the sake of what they might get, or imagined they could get, they were willing to stand by the man who had killed this eight hour day measure—This is also on record.

Take another instance. There is a New York union of the Cabinet

makers, a German organization, said to be a Socialist organization par excellence. It goes into the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, and it is barely in there, when articles begin to reach in that journal of theirs denouncing the Socialist movement, denouncing Socialism and throwing obloquy upon Karl Marx. Whenever I feel that I am calumniated, I think of those articles. Why, they have not begun to say about me what they said about Marx in that journal. Did any one ever hear an answer, a protest to that from the borers from within? The journal is clear of that.

Take this other instance of the cigar-makers. When their employers wanted a tariff reduction, they passed resolutions in the interest of their employers for a tariff reduction, and thereby put themselves diametrically opposed to the employees of those employers who needed rather a high tariff. While that was going on, did any one ever hear a single voice against that on the part of the borers from within in their own journal?—Never!

“Boring from within” was but a blind for the theory of “dropping” the union. Boring from within meant to throw up the sponge, sheathe the sword, and become a traitor to the working class. Boring from within meant that you had to keep quiet, and get the applause of the labor fakir, so that he might do what he wanted to.

Take two instances that are palpating now in the United States. It is a well known fact that the Cuban cigar-makers get the highest wages among the cigar makers. That fact is not agreeable to the employers. It is a well known fact that the employers have always endeavored to get those Cuban cigar-makers to join the International Union, so that while they would still be paying “union wages,” they would, in the point of fact, pay the Cubans lower wages. A bloody conflict is now on in Tampa, Fla. With the connivance of the capitalists, the local branch of the International Union of Cigar-makers has fired shots into the Cuban organization of cigar makers. That strike is obedient to the interests of the employers. Their labor lieutenants are managing it so as to compel these men of the La Resistencia organization to come into the International Union, and when they get into the International Union, then the employers can pay them “union wages,” and yet pay them less than they get now. Have you heard a single one of those who claim that “boring from within” is the right thing raise the voice of indignation against that crime against the workers, against that obsequious obedience to the dictates of the capitalists? I have not heard it.

Take the instance of the machinists. The machinists wanted shorter hours, and agitated for that. The employers finally found that they could not pretend not to hear, and said: “We grant you two hours a week,”—and thereupon posted notices whereby they take off five minutes here and ten minutes yonder, five minutes in this place and ten minutes in the other place, so that after all, out of the two hours alleged to be granted, fully one hour and a half are taken away, and you know what that means—that the other half hour has to go with them. But for the labor lieutenants in the International Machinists' Union that thing could not go on. The rank and file of the machinists would have discovered it. The capitalists needed these labor lieutenants to pull the wool over the eyes of the working men. The capitalists themselves could no do it, consequently they call upon the O'Connells and Warners and the rest of their labor lieutenants and officers of that union, the Organized Scabbery of that union, and these call meetings, and advise the men to accept the proposition as a “victory,” claiming that “the two hours have been granted.” In the midst of that what did the men who wanted to bore from within say? Not a word. If they attempted to rise, the labor lieutenants and their sub-lieutenants would jump at them, would call them scabs, and they are afraid of being called names, so consequently they keep quiet.

Upon these facts and these principles, the Socialists organized in the Socialist Labor Party organized the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. It said, these unions cannot be ignored, nor can they be bored from within exclusively. They must be battered to pieces from without. The bulk of the working men are disorganized because they have made an experience with these organizations that are controlled by the labor lieutenants of the capitalists. The unorganized men we try to organize into the Alliance, and with their aid try to reform those unions, and bring them over. In the pursuit of this policy, of course, there is war. You cannot establish a national organization like the S. T. & L. A. and have the A. F. of L. and the K. of L. or what there is left of it, to agree that that means friendship. They immediately began to denounce, and the S. T. & L. A. has marched upon those forces, and its conduct, undeniable by any truthful or self-respecting man, has been this: It organizes the working men; in any conflict between the workingman and the capitalist, (whether the working man is within the Alliance or disorganized entirely on the outside, or organized in the pure and simple union), if there is a real conflict, the Alliance stands by those men, regardless of the organization, as it has done in more than one instance. If, however, the conflict is a conflict between labor and capital in appearance only, where the working men are being used as food for cannon, obedient to some stock jobbing enterprise, or where the labor fakirs are doing for the employers what they cannot do for themselves in the Union, as now in the case of the machinists, then we of the S. T. & L. A. say that it would be a betrayal of the interests of the working class to keep quiet and get the applause, the friendship, or the approval of these labor lieutenants. Then say we, as we are saying in the case of this conflict in Tampa, as in this case of the machinists: “Workingmen, you are being deceived, you are being deceived by the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class.” While we are doing that, of course we are being covered with calumnies. But this movement depends upon men, and not upon easily frightened children. As the sun will break through the darkest clouds, so will the correct course, the integrity, the purity of the Alliance shine across all the clouds of calumny that are being hurled against it. We organize the men; we combat these pure and simple organizations, and expect to make them surrender. Already one of them, the wagonmakers, came within eight or twelve votes of surrendering. Others may not surrender, and will have to be taken by storm. These pure and simple organizations are for the hands of the capitalist class because these facts are held by the labor lieutenants of the capitalists. These facts must be captured; they cannot be wheeled into line for the working class.

There are just three theories with regard to the trades union. One theory is held by those who absolutely oppose the Socialist movement. They say the union is quite enough. All the good that there is in the world, from bicycles up to star showers in the November midnight sky, everything is due to the union. I have not spent any time with that theory. Should it be deemed necessary, I might take it up later.

The other theory is either “bore from within,” or “abandon the union,” which means the same thing. I have shown you what it amounts to.

The third theory is that of the Alliance; that boring from within, with the labor fakir in possession, is a waste of time, and that the only way to do is to stand by the workingmen always. To organize them, to lighten them, and whenever a conflict breaks out in which their brothers are being fooled and used as food for cannon, to have the S. T. & L. A. throw itself in the midst of the fray, and sound the note of sense.

In pursuit of this policy we have anxiously, I for one, looked for an argument against our position. To this day I have not heard one. All that I have heard is calumnious charges against the Alliance. In that yielding the floor to my opponent, who, I understand, is to bring arguments, if he brings any they will be the first I have ever heard, and no one will listen to him more attentively than myself. (Great applause.)

HARRIMAN:

The propositions that are laid down by the opposition are that the class struggle should be recognized by the trades union movement, and that political action should be its mode of procedure. Now, that is not the question before this audience for discussion. It is not a question of political action. All Socialists endorse independent political action on the part of working men. The question before this audience to-day—and if I do not quote it correctly, I wish the chairman would call my attention to it—is: “Resolved that the tactics of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance against pure and simple trades unionism is for the benefit of the working class, and for the promotion of Socialism in America.” (Great Applause.) Never mind. That will not be credited to me, that time. Now it is not a question of opposing political action, but a question of opposing the tactics of the S. T. & L. A. against trade unionism. This is the proposition before us, and nothing else.

What are the tactics of the S. T. & L. A. against trade unionism? What are they? They were not told here to-night. We were told that political action is their tactics. Very well. That is not the tactics against trade unionism, for a man might be in favor of political action, and yet not oppose old line trade unionism. Not at all. He might endeavor to add political action to the tactics; not oppose trade unionism, but add that as another weapon of their warfare. What now are the tactics? In Mr. De Leon's paper of March 4th he says: “Of course the S. L. P. is opposed to the kind of trade unionism that are re-tailed over the Gompers' counter.” (Laughter.)—Now let us look just

one moment further—but fortunately for the working class there is another kind of trades unionism.” That is, he is opposed to it, or to pure and simple trade unionism—he wants the other kind—he is opposed, not necessarily to the fakirs, but to trade unionism. All right. Let's follow it up. I will go just one moment further, and before I do, I will mention—(Applause)—after I come a little further—(Applause)—will mention only one of the unions to which he has referred. (Great Applause.)

In the national convention of the S. L. P. one of the speakers made this remark in a discussion, in a page article—and another page article is filled with the same proposition and similar arguments—(Applause)—he says: “We ought not to attempt to keep in existence that thing which we are fighting to keep out of existence. No, we call upon the Socialists of the United States to get out of the pure and simple organizations, and to smash them to pieces.” Mark you, it is a “smash” of the old line trade unionism “to pieces.” (Laughter.) Now, those are the tactics against us—“to smash it to pieces.”

Now let us see if their actions corroborate their words. Let us see if that is theory or practice. The gentleman has spoken of a number of trade unions—the coal miners in Pennsylvania, the miners in Tennessee, the wood workers of Wisconsin, the furniture makers of New York, the cigar-makers of New York, and others. I will not go into all of them. I will take one. One is sufficient. I would be willing to go into all if there were time to do it. One is enough. I will take the cigar-makers, for instance. (Laughter, applause and yells.) Hold on there. He says the facts concerning the Davis cigar factory are these: that Honestie and Molester, both of the International Union, called the shop to a meeting and had the question of strike discussed, whereupon, by an overwhelming vote, the shop decided not to strike. First, the meeting was not called by Honestie. He was not present, and Mr. De Leon knows he was not present. He won't deny this. (Applause.) Furthermore, when, on the second meeting these men were present, there was no vote taken. Why was there no vote taken? The gentleman says, whenever hunger or needs or similar motives prompt the need, the gentlemen in the strike committee business would make a raid upon the workers in some cigar factory, ordering them out on strike. He never calumnies, does he? (Laughter and yells.) “The upshot was always the same. Initiation and other dues were scorned in strike committee salaries were made and the workers were sold out.” Now let me look at that just for a minute. First, the strike was called in order to sell the men out and take in the dues. That was the purpose. The International Cigar-maker's constitution provides that no reduction of wages shall be permitted, unless the facts are submitted to the entire union the country over, and when they get their assent, then that local union or shop may accept the reduction, and not until then. He will not deny that fact when he takes the platform after me. Mr. Davis, in his petition for an injunction against the union, said that he was compelled to reduce the bill of prices—the wages—in order to continue his business. Then they submitted the matter to the union, and the petition for a strike came back, and in those court papers, which I am sure Mr. De Leon knows of, Mr. Davis spoke of the strike permission given to them. He will not deny this. Now, since he was compelled to reduce the wages, according to his own allegation, since the men submitted the matter to the unions, and since the unions by a vote ordered the strike—I ask you, what becomes of the statement that they did it simply to sell out the strike and take in dues? They were compelled to do it or they would have been expelled from the union for not ordering the strike. And when the second meeting came up, they went in there and told those 200 men that there would be a strike because the shop had not the control over the lowering of wages; the entire craft was interested in the lowering of wages and that the union at large had ordered the strike and they commanded them out. What happened? 200 men walked out and about sixty men went back to scrub it. (Snickers.) The large majority came out. Now Mr. De Leon says that they organized the shop from top to bottom. (De Leon: Yes, I said nothing of the sort.) In your paper, yes, of course, yes. Yes. All right. (Laughter and applause.) It was lucky I had the paper. (Laughter.) He says that they organized it from top to bottom. Now, mark you, about twenty-five of them went back and those twenty-five—a portion of them—were Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance men. A portion of them signed an affidavit and joined with Davis asking the court to grant an injunction against the union, and upon the affidavit of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance men and Mr. Davis jointly, they granted the injunction against the working class, the cigar-makers of New York. He will not deny that. He will not deny that. (De Leon: Yes I will.) He will not deny that. Furthermore, now, why I brought this case up is this: to show to you men that in this cigar-makers' strike, Mr. De Leon had united with Davis to scrub it on the union; they united with Davis in order to make the affidavit and get the injunction against the union. Immediately, he organized those scabs, they went back, and Mr. Davis alleges that they were willing to work for the reduction in wages, and in the injunction he alleges this, and they joined with him asking for the injunction. Immediately after the organization of this, the following advertisement appears in the papers.

“Wanted on handwork, jobs from \$9.25 to \$14. Pioneer Cigar-makers' Alliance of S. T. & L. A.” (Voice from a left hand box: “Mention the paper!”) (Harriman continues.) “Samuel I. Davis, 520-522 E. Eighty-first street. (Voice again: “Mention the paper.”) Harriman pretends not to hear. (Voice again: “Mention the paper.”) Harriman hesitatingly examines paper.) It is the N. Y. “Journal” of March 3. (Hisses: a voice: “a capitalist paper.”) (Applause.) Hold on there. It was your advertisement. What does it mean? He said to you here this evening that whenever the working class, whether in the S. T. & L. A. or not, whether organized or whether members of the old unions, were in a struggle, that if they were justified, they united with those men in battle, and I say that that was a case where they were justified, because the Cigar-makers' Union, according to their constitution, called the strike. The vast majority walked out and the S. T. & L. A. with the minority, scrubbed upon that union and endeavored to break it. (Applause.) This hold-on—this is consistent. This is the effort first, on the part of Davis to lower wages; on the part of your friends to keep pace with your theory of smashing the union in practice and in theory. The practice and the theory tally.

Now what is trades unionism? Is it fakism? Not a bit of it. There may be fakirs in it. You find those things, men, in every organization. How does trade unionism develop? This is the capitalist endeavor to make money by employing the worker, and wages means that the capitalist pays the worker less than the worker produces. Now the less the capitalist pays the worker, the more easily he can gratify his desires by the energy he gets from him, from products that he gets from him. The higher the rate of wages the less the capitalist takes. But when the capitalist decreases the wages until there is so much pain that the working class cannot endure it any longer, they bunch together, and your union is born. There is your union. Now the struggle is on between the two organizations. The union struggles to force its wages up with strike and boycott. Yes. That is pure and simple trades unionism. That is all. It has not yet progressed to political action, but the great mass of men are within the organization struggling to raise the wages, to increase their material interests by the strike and boycott. All Socialists say this is not enough, but all Socialists say that so far as it goes, that is the only method in the capitalist system—so far, I say, as it goes. But when two great organizations, the working class on one hand, the capitalist class on the other, meet in their struggle, they represent great power, and where power develops there the opportunity to a greater or less degree for corruption to develop; but, because some men come and fasten themselves upon a union like a barnacle, they do not necessarily, that is their actions are not necessarily a part of the union, their actions are only brought to bear upon the union, and it would be no more a part of trade unionism than Mr. De Leon's tactics towards them is a part of Socialism. (Applause.) Hold on, not a bit—so that it would be just as foolish to fight the trade union because of their few dishonest men as it would be to fight Socialism because of peculiar tactics. It is not a part of trades unionism. It is a part of the rogue's constitution of working his desires at the expense of his class—not a part of the principles of the movement at all. (Laughter.)

Now just watch it develop a little further. I say the great mass of the working class do not know what Socialism is; they are unacquainted with our philosophy, and that being true, and since Socialism or since trades unionism, is born by the lowering of wages or by economic pressure—if we were to wipe out every trade union on the face of the earth to-day, to-morrow your economic pressure would breed them again and develop them again. You cannot stop them. They are children of your system, born to stay as long as capitalism stays. Now mark you; to fight them means what? They do not know what Socialism is, I say. They come there to benefit themselves, rather to get to raise their wages. Being ignorant of your philosophy, the very moment you attack trade unions and say you are going to smash them to pieces, that moment you attack their means of gaining their

livelihood, that is, their means of preserving and carrying on the fight against the capitalist class, their means of keeping them up—always, mark you this, I say, always necessarily with a downward tendency, and must be. Now then the moment you strike the thing that helps and guards them, the means by which they fight their great battle with the capitalist class, last moment they think you are their enemy, that moment you arouse their antagonism, that moment you inspire their hatred and you divide your men into two hostile camps, the trades union movement on the one side and your S. T. & L. A. on the other, and there the workingmen fight like cats and dogs, while all their power is being sapped, fighting over the policy, fighting over a difference, merely because not that they are dishonest, I say to you that the hundreds of thousands of men in the trades unions are not dishonest—that there are a few, yes, that there are a few in this movement, yes, but that doesn't condemn your movement because they are dishonest. (Applause.) Now, you see, all this divides them into two hostile camps. I do not have to tell you men that you are divided, that you are divided here to-night. You are fighting each other to-night, and you are all Socialists fighting over a difference in a trade union policy, and that is all. You are fighting to the end, and it is this policy that has divided you.

Furthermore, it has divided their party themselves, for in 1896 the S. T. & L. A. split, and in 1899—(to De Leon) don't look surprised. (De Leon) I don't look surprised. Your memory is failing you. In 1899 the S. T. & L. A. split—didn't look up surprised that time and it split upon this policy, upon the policy the difference between the S. T. & L. A. policy against the trades union movement. We fought over it and we split on it. Why? Because we knew that to follow the policy meant to array the working class against Socialism by incorrect tactics. What did we do? We look at them and we say, the Social Democratic party to-day, which to-day contains the majority of the S. T. & L. A.—he will not say a majority, but I will say a large majority in the United States—but he split, over conventions about equal size, and we fought over this particular difference—we say to-day, that if you would enter the unions with all your members—he says we did and we were weak when we were struggling for the control of the union. Ah! Were you weak? Then you should have waited until you were strong. (Laughter.) How could you hope to gain the control of a trade union movement when you were weak and when the vast majority of the members of the trade unions didn't know what you wanted. I say, we tell you you are making a mistake. Go into your union; when a strike comes on, espouse the cause of the union, take up the fight of the union, make their interests your interests, and when you do, you will find that they will open their ears to every argument that promises a benefit and a means to further their ends. Then they will listen to your arguments on political action. You say, No; we have tried. Well, I say, Yes, yes; we have tried it; and let me assure you we have tried it in dead earnest. I do not make this statement because I think they do not know it. Here are some facts.

I do not take my own literature. I always prefer to prove the case against the opposition by their own literature. (Laughter.) Here is a part of it. In their debate upon this famous resolution was passed: "If any member of the S. T. & L. A. accepts office in a pure and simple trade or labor organization, he shall be considered antagonistic to the S. T. & L. A. and shall be expelled"—the S. T. & L. A. and the S. T. & L. A. are identical in this wish—but if any officer of a pure and simple trade or labor organization applies for membership in the S. T. & L. A., he shall be rejected." Here is a very interesting little statement here. Now this first is from Kuhn. Kuhn opposed that their National Secretary—of the S. T. & L. A. He says: "It has been my experience with a number of correspondents of mine who are organizers of Sections of the S. T. & L. A., that they were at the same time officers of such unions." I mean by that that they were to work from within, that it is possible. Now, mark you—"Comrade Meyer himself for a long time"—author of the resolution I just read—"was an officer of such a union." It is possible, isn't it? (Laughter.) "Hammond, for instance, was for many years, I think, an officer in the Typographical local in Minneapolis"—it is possible, isn't it?—"another comrade, one of our best men in Brooklyn, a man, one of the most active men, was also a member, hem, hem, (applause), hem, (great applause), hem, a man, hem, hem, (great applause), and president of the Carpenters' Union in Brooklyn."

Furthermore, let us take Teche's statement. I want to show you that it is possible. "As far as I am personally concerned," Teche says—one of the men who spoke in this national convention—"I am heartily in sympathy with the sentiments spoken, but I believe at the same time there is such a thing as pulling the strings a little too tight, to run a little too fast, and I believe with Comrade Kuhn that circumstances alter cases in many instances. I will give you an instance in my own case. I have belonged to a trade union ever since I came to this country and belonged to the same in the old country, a small concern, only about, say, ninety men in the whole country left of it in the whole organization. Every officer belongs to our party." It is possible, isn't it? Old tried and true comrades, remarkable, isn't it? Can't bore from within, can you?—"and I can further point out that in percentage of members who are Socialists and collections made, there is no organization in this country that can come up to it, especially if we take into consideration the wages we have been earning. If the resolution goes through without any further ado, all of us must resign, and we flatter ourselves that we have elevated our union." Don't you see you can work inside the union if you know how to do it? (Laughter.) Here was a man who knew how. I will leave that one then and go on to the next one, although it continues on that line. Well, I will go ahead—"at the same time to try to bring that organization into the S. T. & L. A. is impossible"—couldn't do that—"although the majority of us are Socialists"—according to his own statement.

Now here comes another one, which is very important—"I believe if this motion goes through as it is before us, it will mean that those men who are to-day presidents secretaries and financial secretaries, whether they have any salary or not makes no difference," he says—all of them, there are a whole lot of them around the country—it is possible—all of them—"it means that they will have to step out of their offices and take their places on the floor"—Now mark you, here is the important point—"I believe that it will be the best means of swinging the whole organization into the S. T. & L. A."

Do you not see that the arguments prove one thing above all others, that boring within is possible, and you can bore within and gain the confidence of the union. The gentleman upon this platform cannot go to the trade union people of which he spoke, the Cigarmakers' Union in New York, because of their action and get any hearing whatever before the members there because of the action. I say to you men that the possibility of boring within is infinite in its scope. Because you work with the laborers in their struggles and in their strifes and when they are in their fight and the party backs them in their struggles, you open their ears not only to political action, but to the philosophy that lies behind the political action, behind the political action that is taught; and all over the country everywhere there are to-day unions taking up the proposition of the collective ownership of the means of production. I can cite to you the Central Federation of Labor in New York, the Cleveland Central Labor Union Constitution, and they both provide for the collective ownership and independent political action. Simply because those who have been patient and who have worked within have gained the confidence of the people, they have listened to them, and they have gained an advantage by gaining a hearing before those men.

Now the vast majority of the people in the trade unions vote upon the law of the trade union. They elect their men, they make their laws for the members by a popular vote, not by the vote of the officers, and I maintain that the laws of the trade union organization are due, in the interest of independent political action, to the ignorance of those members upon this point, and not to their wilful dishonesty. If they are wilfully dishonest, as I have said, you might as well give up the entire fight, for why should we argue with dishonest men? But if they are honest and do not know, then we can come in among them, espouse their cause, gain their confidence, and they will listen to our doctrines upon political action, independent political action, and by this means we will be able to induce them to add to the boycott and the strike the ballot as a further weapon to gain their ends, for with the ballot in their hands they are all-powerful. But, if you arouse antagonism, you cannot get the ballot in their hands.

I deny that the unions are controlled by a few men. Take for instance the International Brotherhood of Engineers. Our friend told us three years ago that they were destroyed wasted the substance of 49 years of existence. To-day after that struggle they are more powerful than ever before. Eighty-four thousands belong to them. They have a million and a half dollars in reserve fund, and it only shows that though they may have been temporarily crushed, yet the capitalist system will produce the union again, and if they are not Socialists, if the Socialist propaganda has not reached them, it will simply make the same old union over again, and all your fight is for nothing. (Great applause and cheers.)

DE LEON—I hope the intended insult upon your intellect has not escaped you. The arguments of the gentleman who has just consumed thirty minutes were partly devoted to statements I did not make at all, and that were no part of my argument. (Laughter and applause.) He had to put up a straw man of his own. I cannot blame him, as his case is a bad one. (Laughter.) The other part of his answer was to try to foist upon me a straw man of a rule. I did not say, as was falsely imputed to me, that the point was how to get the rank and file to vote. I did not cross the political line, as stated that as to the ideal, and then I went on to something else. He crossed the political line. I may have time, ten minutes, at the end to take that up. What I did say was that in the economic struggle the aspirations of the working men were run into the ground by the labor lieutenants of capital. All that he said about trying to give them the ballot had nothing

to do with the case. We try to have the workingmen improve their condition NOW. I tried to make that clear enough, and I maintained and I argued that the conditions of the workers could not be improved NOW, despite the labor fakir argument we have just heard. Their condition cannot be improved so long as they are controlled by the labor lieutenants of capital; and I stated why: because every time these men proceed to do something in their own behalf as in the case of the machinists to-day, the labor lieutenants will see to it that they are deceived; and he, venturesome though he was, did not dare to deny that these machinists are being deceived now, and that the alleged two hours granted to them is a swindle upon them, and that swindle is practiced upon them by the aid of the labor lieutenants of capital, and the press of the "borders from within."

His other insult to you was to make out that I said that the rank and file were dishonest. Oh, what eloquence did we hear—regular pulpit eloquence on the subject. Clear enough I stated that the rank and file were earnest in their attempt to improve their condition, and they are surely honest in that desire. Who is there here who could have understood me otherwise, and that does not know that it could not possibly be imputed to me that I said that the rank and file were dishonest?

The other insult perpetrated upon you was to quote the speech of Comrade Teche, who has a little bit of a union under entirely exceptional circumstances. He concealed the facts to you, and then gave you Teche's speech, as though the status of his union were a general thing, and he proceeded to quote some other exceptional instances on the point of officers. An intelligent man, a man who is not talking for a snap victory, a man who respects his cause, doesn't build upon exceptions: he takes the rule. I quoted instances of not little, petty unions like Teche's organization. I quoted the woodworkers, of thousands of them; quoted the cigarmakers of thousands of them; quoted the machinists, of thousands of them; quoted the boiler-makers, of thousands of them—unions of power, numerically, however slight their power to improve their condition, and that they were run into the ground by the labor lieutenants of capital, as is happening now with the machinists.

Another insult to your intelligence. (Snickers from Kangaroo.) You will laugh the wrong side of your mouths one of these days. I have seen Democratic crowds of workingmen who laughed at me once. They don't laugh now. Another insult to your intelligence was to pretend to make an argument against my position that attacked the boring from within; and in what did that charge consist? In repeating charges started by our adversaries, and which I here want to say are a falsehood from beginning to end. I mean the Davis affair. But I want to grant, for the sake of argument, that the charge is true. What would you say of a man who stood before you and denied that Socialism was right, and instead of attacking the theory of Socialism were to quote Millerand who remains in the French cabinet, a Socialist in a cabinet that shoots workingmen; or who were to cite Mr. Harriman himself, whose organization in California applies for capitalist political jobs? (Great applause, hisses.) Or, as a man I know of did on one occasion, quote some Socialist who beat his wife and says: "Is that Socialism? Then I don't want any of it." That sort of argument is an insult.

Even if what is charged did happen at Davis's, it would be a wrongful act; it could not overthrow a principle. But (and our stenographer is present) those "facts" I here call as absolutely false from beginning to end. There was no International Union at Davis's! IT WAS AN OPEN SHOP. His men were called out by the labor lieutenants of capital. (Applause and hisses.) All, hisses all you like. His men were called out by two members of the Organized Scabbery. Knowing these worthies, they voted against going out. It was not, in such cases, necessary to prove that the whole International Union. The shop crew decided not to strike; consequently there was no strike in the shop. A few indeed some of them, or many, went out under the threat of these labor lieutenants of capital that they would be scabs—so much the worse for their manliness. But the facts as they were presented here to-night are absolutely false.

THE PEOPLE was quoted. When I said "I didn't say that," my words were twisted into one of his tricks. I presumed the gentleman claimed that I used that in my argument. Whatever is in the PEOPLE I stand by in every respect. But he didn't say anything after that to justify that quotation, and I wondered what it was going to be all about.

He claimed that I did not come to the theory of the Alliance. The theory of the Alliance is that the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class—based upon those illustrations that I have furnished you from large unions, not little, pious unions, Teche unions that he tried to make you believe by quotations amount to something—that these lieutenants of labor prevent the rank and file from doing anything in their own behalf. I showed the deterioration of the working class and their economic decline, notwithstanding a large trades union movement. And I showed you how we did try to "bore from within," and how that failed; and I proved that their "boring from within" amounts to nothing but a pretence. Their "boring from within" means to "talk" Socialism. Oh, yes, send a man to a pure and simple trades union to "talk" Socialism in the abstract; he is welcome; that adds prestige of the Organized Scabbery that runs the union. But if a strike is started by the capitalists in that trade through their labor lieutenants, and you attempt to open your mouth and show the workingmen that they are being betrayed, why, that is something else—that would not be the "talking" of "abstract Socialism," that no one cares anything about, anymore. That hurts the Organized Scabbery. That is not tolerated. And the present "borders from within" "bore" by bowing in submission. We claim that it is the duty of the honest and energetic Socialists to call the attention of the masses to it every time they are being cheated. And we charge these borders from within, as we prove it now in the instance of the machinists, that in their papers they say not a word against it, on the contrary, they are whooping it up for the fakirs, as they did here to-night, claiming for an organization that has millions of dollars when it has not got it; claiming for it to have 80,000 members, when it has not got it; claiming for it a victory, which is a fraud, and a snare, and a delusion to the workers. Of course, such "borders from within" can be heard; of course, they will get resolutions in their behalf; but the rank and file of the workingmen will continue declining, urged on in their decline by the conduct of these so-called Socialists. The attitude of the Alliance is that the duty of the Socialist is to be with the working class in all its working-class endeavors, and that it is the bounden duty of every Socialist to have his voice heard clear, loud, emphatic—notwithstanding all the lies uttered against him; notwithstanding all the calumnies that Scabbery may hurl at his head—that they utter clearly what is going on and teach the working people what it is they are being run into doing; how, in each one of these cases, the working people are being used for food for cannon for the capitalist class.

We are told that upon that line little progress can be made. Well, I believe so, too, comparatively little, but we do not believe in a progress that is deceptive. We do not believe in progress except in progress that is progress. We do not believe in being able to say "so and so many unions have endorsed us," with over 50,000 members in New York; and coming out with a paltry seven or eight thousands votes. We do not believe (laughter and applause) that that is progress. On the contrary, we believe that whatever progress is made must be made by education.

I remember the time when the S. T. & L. A. started its career on the political field. Among the very men who now denounce our trade union attitude were those who denounced us then for denouncing the Democratic and Republicans "too severely." We were "antagonizing the labor leaders!" A political party was established, and yet they did not want to have any "trouble," any "inconvenience." So I look now over their journals from beginning to end, and the rascality of the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class can be seen in all of their journals, without exception, to go by unreprieved, uncondemned. Nay, worse; every time that the capitalist wants to run down the revolutionary pulse of the workingmen—run it into the ground, as in this case of the machinists, by telling bogus pious stories about bogus "victories," thus repeating the language of the capitalist—every such time we find these "borders from within" acting as veritable hand-maids of these capitalists and of these labor lieutenants of capital.

The work may be slow; the work is arduous; but arduous, indeed, is the course of the Socialist movement. Arduous, indeed, is the course of the educator. The gentlemen who talk and believe as Mr. Harriman, believe in an "education" that runs away from the people you ought to attack. They believe in an "education" that consists in whooping it up for the enemy. They believe in an "education" that helps the capitalist rivet ignorance upon the workingmen—that is the sort of "progress" that they advocate. Whereas the policy of the S. T. & L. A. is to go slow, gather these men in hold up the clear principle. If a wrong is done to a union if the rank and file is being deceived, why, then, even if that whole rank and file rises against you and denounces you, stand your ground; stand it—because the day will come when that rank and file will remember that YOU told them the truth; then, also, will they remember the men who "bored from within," who acted as prostitutes for the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class. Then will you find progress; then will it come with rapid strides, for that real work has been noted. Unless there is real work back of it, there is no progress worth mentioning.

For the rest, I can say that—unless some new argument is made; unless the gentleman has reserved for his next thirty minutes the real argument, that is to say, not the citing of exceptional cases, but arguments based upon general facts, to show how "boring from within" could make progress—I shall be able to withdraw from this debate, when it ends, satisfied that the cause of the S. T. & L. A. is the correct one. I have heard to-night identically what I have been hearing for the last four years. They first start with calumny upon calumny; one fellow invents it and the others recklessly repeat it. We mention the facts from their own journals; they shut their eyes to that. As to argument—they are remarkably silent.

The gentleman referred to a split in the S. T. & L. A. and I looked

surprised; and he was surprised at my surprise. (Laughter.) I did not imagine that he would put his foot into that hole. Yes, there was a "split." The Central Labor Federation, which he has quoted here like a sweet morsel, had a souvenir. In that souvenir it printed advertisements of the capitalist parties during a campaign—very much like the other papers, or some of them in New York, of the "borders from within." Thereupon a noise was made against the man, Bohm, who, as secretary of the Federation, had charge of the souvenir, and was also general secretary of the S. T. & L. A. To go into these facts is almost painful, for the reason that it is time spent in stating things that every body should know by this time. The General Executive Board of the S. T. & L. A. held up Bohm. His excuse was that he knew nothing about it, that his partner did it—which was possible; an honest man may be deceived by a wicked partner. We waited and said to him: "If, indeed, your partner cheated you, then you must separate from your partner p.d.q." We waited and waited, waited and waited. Then the Convention of the Alliance met, and I rose during that convention and asked him: "Are you still in partnership with that man?" At that convention, "borders from within" to-day, one man from Chicago, rose and objected to the question and Bohm refused to answer. Thereupon I voted "No" to his re-election as Secretary of the Alliance, together with his Central Labor Federation that backed him, having been branded there as really guilty of the crime of putting capitalist advertisements in a labor publication. Just as soon as he was branded, the "Volkszeitung" took him up with open arms and the Central Labor Federation which they denounced before, suddenly became a pure thing that was "boring from within" to their heart's content. The Alliance fired this Federation pack. That was the "split." It was the split that takes place when you grab a rascal, and kick him out of the house. Of course, the rascal falls in with the other rascals where he belonged. (Great applause, hisses.)

I wish to dispose of another point. It is this: The claim that it was a great mistake on our part to start educating when we did and should have waited till we were "strong in the unions." Of course, there is one thing that he omitted to state in his course of misrepresenting my argument. He omitted to state that we should "not have started in with insisting that the men should vote for the S. T. & L. A." That was not our line of work. What we wanted was to redeem them from capitalist influence on the economic field, so that they could have something right away. We should have waited till we were strong; that is, a man should wait till he can swim before he goes into the water. (Laughter.) Wait until all the men are converted to Socialism then start to educate them! (Laughter.) We went into these unions, and when the labor fakir came there with capitalist propositions, we rose and tried to teach the rank and file. The rank and file—not through dishonesty, indeed not—the rank and file could not take our views; didn't dare to take our views, because in most of these unions there is a system of blackmail and browbeating that the labor leaders exercise upon the men. For the sake of keeping their jobs, for the sake of not losing their sick and death benefit advantages, the men caved in; and when the labor fakir gave the signal, those men voted as the labor fakir dictated. Finally, when we were driving the labor fakir to the corner the split came. The conscientious borders from within then landed on the outside, and have continued to bore from the outside, with the assistance of which alone can simultaneous boring from within be effective. On the other hand, those who stayed there, "preserving the full sympathy of these unions," what have they got to congratulate themselves with, except candy sacks, resolutions that mean nothing, resolutions for "collective ownership," resolutions this way and that way—while in the meantime, every practical attempt on the part of the rank and file to improve itself continues to be run into the ground, the men divided among themselves, according as the capitalist interests of their various employers may dictate. (Great applause, hisses.)

HARRIMAN—I am surprised to hear the gentleman speak so frequently of being abused, so much of calumny, when he first takes up the unions one after the other and says that the men active in those unions are all in the pay of the capitalist class or under the influence of the capitalists. What is that but calumny? When he referred to the statements that I made on the Cigarmakers' Union—and you will observe that he carefully steered clear of that Cigarmakers' Union case excepting he said the whole thing is false, the whole thing is a lie—then he said, referring to us, as giving ourselves as prostitutes to the capitalist class, in order to rivet their influence upon the trade union movement, and yet he is a man that doesn't believe in calumny. (Laughter.) What a clean, white tongue he has. I will try my hand a little. Let me show you. I will read to you here. I will not call him a liar. No, I will read to you something else and will let the facts talk a little.

Mr. Davis alleged that it was the purpose of the union to raise the wages, that he was compelled to lower the price and that those that remained with him were willing to work for the lower price, and Mr. De Leon said in the paper of March 11, which I have here, that they had a contract for two years—by the agreement there made, which holds for two years, the shop is to be an Alliance shop. Now Davis alleged in his affidavit for an injunction—which I have here, which Mr. De Leon says is false, and I will read a little to you—he says that the men working there were willing to work for less and willing to work for lower wages, and that he paid an enormous sum for new workmen, because they were keeping the men from coming to work, and the men belonging to the S. T. & L. A. said they were being kept away, "jittered with as they came to work, and Mr. De Leon says he had a contract for two years. How much did you get for the job? (Great applause, yells, storm of hisses, a thrill of indignation goes through the audience. Harriman, aside: "I mean that.")

I would not have called Mr. De Leon a liar had he not called me one first. This is only a fire at him from his own guns.

He first says, How will they dare stay on the floor of the union if they are radical? How will they dare join the S. T. & L. A.? It is the same argument.

He says, We do not want to go in the water until we learn to swim. That is, he suggests that it is my statement. What I told them was to wait while they are in the water and they should have stayed there till they learned how to swim. (Laughter.)

He proposes to rivet upon the capitalist class—he said upon the working class—the influence of the capitalist class. When he finds trade unions in New York that will not listen to Socialism because they scab upon the unions, will those unions not give their support to the very men who oppose Socialism, so long as the men themselves, the membership, do not understand Socialism? If you fight the union, you do the very thing that rivets the matter, that rivets the power of the dishonest man upon the union, because he gains his power by reason of their not understanding the Socialist philosophy. You must make them understand, or you will never make any headway, and because I say that, he speaks of a few little unions. Then I brought this affidavit, which he says is a lie. I will refer to this union. He says that I refer to a few little unions that have no membership. I spoke of the Amalgamated Engineers. He says they are weak. I have here their journal; it comes monthly; and here it shows \$2,000 members, and here is their official report (holding up a paper), showing \$1,500,000 in the treasury. He cannot deny it. Here are the facts. He may say it is a false statement of facts, but every year, and sometimes semi-annually, if there is a weak union and there is a strong union which has more than its pro rata, they have that money adjusted; they have an equalization method, and they put so much money in the treasury, not in this country, but all over the world, so that every union has an equal amount per capita in its treasury at practically all times, and that equalization prevents a fraudulent statement of facts concerning their finances, for if they said more, then the unions would draw upon them. I say to you that the accusations against those things, the methods of the unions, is overdrawn.

Now, let me look at this. The purposes, furthermore, he speaks of the union. We will start with the Cigarmakers' Union. He says everything I said was a lie, mark you, concerning this Cigarmakers' Union proposition. I told you that the union could not declare a strike, unless they could not avoid declaring a strike on occasions when the scale of wages was lower, unless they got the permission of the entire union. If the wages went down, they must declare a strike, unless directed to the contrary by the union. Here is the constitution—and he denies it.

"Should any local union desire to reduce its bill of prices wherein 75 or more members are involved, the officers of the union or unions shall submit a statement of the facts to the international president giving the reasons why the bill should be reduced, which application and reasons shall be submitted by the international president to a vote of all the local unions." Now, it says: "But no strike for an increase of wages"—that is to say, no call—"shall be considered legal unless approved by a two-thirds majority of all votes cast." It is a lie, is it? Who has lied? (Turning to De Leon.) Take your own medicine. (Snickers from Kangaroos.)

Here is another proposition. He says you cannot get upon the floors of the unions and argue the case, because you would be dismissed. Here is a resolution of the Central Federated body of which he is opposed to, because they left him and would not endorse his tactics, and their proposition is this: They resolve in favor of the collective ownership by the people of all the means of production and distribution, of all the means of communication and transportation; that one-half an hour—or one hour and a half—be devoted to discuss economic, social and political questions the first meeting of each month in their central body. Here is your union, here are the constitution and by-laws. Could give you dozens of them, if we only had time this evening to go through them all.

He says we had 80,000 parading with us, and still had a small vote, yet, with all the advantage the gentleman has had in the State of New York, holding the old name and all the agitation, yet we have cast as

many votes as the Socialist Labor Party; they have come with us in a large part, and they were all honest a few years ago, are they all honest now? (Laughter.)

Let us take up this matter, let us take up this matter, the purpose of the union. No. One. I will run through these so you will see that it was alleged by Mr. Davis himself. Davis says—here is the application for injunction (holds up a paper)—that "the general purpose of the incorporated association hereinbefore named"—the International Cigarmakers' Union—"are to advance the interests of their members, to reduce and keep down the number of hours per day they would be required to work, to enhance the price of wages and to compel their employers to employ in their business only members of said association." That is a wonderful charge to make against a trade union, isn't it?

Now, let us go on, examine this matter as we go through, a little further. "On the first day of February, 1900, and for some time prior thereto, the plaintiffs, in the prosecution of such business, had in their employ about 125 cigarmakers and 20 packers, of nationalities other than Spanish or Cuban; about 25 cigarmakers of the Spanish or Cuban nationality, and about 25 strippers of all nationalities." That makes over 200, you see. "Cigarmakers of Spanish or Cuban nationality constituted what the plaintiffs termed their 'Spanish shop.'" There was also a German shop, and they both came out. Only about 25 or 30 went back. "On or about January 1, 1900, the people took stock and ascertained the condition of their business, and found that it was impossible to continue upon the basis of the prices fixed in the October agreement." May you—that made an agreement with the union* in October. They broke the contract, they were in the act of breaking the contract when the men began to scab. When the S. T. & L. A. went in and organized the shop, they had broken the agreement of October, and it is in the affidavit. Here are the court papers—broken the agreement. "That then upon the plaintiffs appealed to their said employees and informed them that it was impossible for them to continue in business upon the basis of the scale of wages fixed in said October, 1899, agreement, and informed them that the plaintiffs would be compelled to adopt the scale of wages in force prior to the strike of October, 1899." So they had to lower them, there was their own statement for it, the statement of Davis. All right. "That thereafter and on February 12, 1900, the employees of the plaintiffs employed in their said Spanish shop, although they had no cause for complaint as to the wages paid to them, were induced or coerced by hem! hem! hem—the International Union—hem!—to leave the employ of the plaintiffs." Why? Let me look just a moment. Suppose that of the five or six cigarmaking shops here in this city, suppose a majority belonged to the S. T. & L. A. or to the trade union, and one shop undertook to lower the wages, that shop would not be permitted to determine that, because the lowering of the wages interests the craft, and the craft handles it, and for that reason they made their application to the union and were permitted to strike.

Let us go on a little further here. "On or about Saturday, January 27, 1900 some of the cigarmakers belonging to the department known as our German shop stated to my brother and myself that they heard," hem, hem—and—hem (applause), "that they heard" hem, "they heard" hem, an application for a strike in our factory had been filed with the Cigarmakers' International Union, and that our cigarmakers intended holding a meeting that day to consider the question whether they would strike or not." Now, you see, the application is here, they would ask for an application before they are permitted to reduce the wages, and the application came, and the order to strike was made not by the committee, but by the International Union, and those men were compelled to order the strike. "I made no objection to the men's attending to meeting." What meeting? Now, mark you, in Mr. De Leon's report, which he says is a man of straw, because, he says I stand up something to knock down—Why did I do this? Why did I take this stand as show the tactics of the S. T. & L. A. against trade unionism? Because he didn't, and that is the question this evening, and I am discussing the question, and not whatever he might desire to spring. (Applause.) I am not going to Paris to debate about America. We have many national questions. I am discussing the question of the tactics of the S. T. & L. A. against trade unionism and who is acting as an obstacle to the working class. The meeting—"I made no objection to the men's attending the meeting," says Mr. Davis, "and learned subsequently the evening that the meeting had been held, and that the cigarmakers had decided not to strike." That was before, mark you, that the men called the strike. This was the work of the shop, and in this shop where they voted, it was a shop meeting, not a union meeting, a meeting where detectives were placed in order to tell Mr. Davis who had voted for the strike and then he would discharge them, and then go on with his business opposed to the rules of the International Cigarmakers' Union.

Let us see the evidence of that. It follows in the next page like this: "When our hands told me that the second meeting had been called, I requested them and urged them, although some of them expressed themselves as unwilling to do so, to attend the meeting and vote freely upon the questions to be placed before them. I knew from statements that had been made to me by many of my employees, that they were all satisfied to stand by the vote of the Saturday previous"—hem, hem, "The workmen reported to me that they had been prevented from voting. What did I tell you? Certainly; because it was not a shop proposition, and the application had ordered a strike, and it was at this meeting that the men were prevented, and not the former meeting. He cannot deny that fact, here is the statement of it in the affidavit.

Let us go a little further. It is getting a little interesting along here. "As to the manner in which the pending strike took place in my shop, I state that the Cigarmakers' International Union, as represented by the defendants, inaugurated said strike in such a manner as to cause my said firm great and unnecessary loss. In our business of cigarmaking the wrappers of the cigars are chased each day for the next day's work, that is to say that those wrappers are dipped in water, and because of this these wrappers will only keep for a few days." Then he goes on and tells how many there were—long affidavit—and then states that the strike was brought on in order to damage them and keep a large number of workmen out. Now, I have shown that over 200 struck, and he claims that they damaged the wrappers, and he made that one of the reasons why—and other damage—that the affidavit was made, for, as he says, they remained out and injured them to a large extent and to a large sum.

I'll go on a little further with this and see if we can't find something else. Let me see. Here is one of the most interesting of the points. "I was present at the next meeting of the hands"—the next meeting—"held the following Tuesday, and by orders of the committee representing the International Union we were ordered to strike against our will. These are some of the men who went back, mark you. "I state that I have noticed men standing on the block in front of the factory premises all day, and for every day since the strike was ordered, and these men, the pickets, are still there. They interfere with us going to and from work, and we join in the request to the court that they be removed and prevented from interfering with us." To that is appended a list of names, and in that list of names are S. T. & L. A. men. One of them, Mr. Mayer, who organized—and was the organizer, I believe, of the officer in—the union, at least an active man in the union. Among them were two, four, six, seven men, who belonged to the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. (Voice from left-hand box: Read their names. Harriman ignores the request, and the voice repeats the question several times. Chairman threatens to have the individual put out. Finally Harriman reads the names as follows: They have asked me to read the names. They are: Rappaport, Mayers, Ashkenazy, Leibholz, Rappaport again, Rosenthal, Singer. Now, he may deny that these are S. T. & L. A. men—I do not know whether they are or not—but what he does or not, he acknowledges that on the first of these days when I have read to you, he said in his paper here that the men returned to work, he says. I have shown you that they didn't return to work. He says he didn't say it this evening. Ah, but he said it in his tactics against the union. The Alliance took and organized the shop from top to bottom, and then he says a contract was made for two years; and every day Mr. Davis is asking the Cigarmakers' Union, which, he says, desired to go back to work and take their places; and I have been better to the Cigarmakers' Union over his own signature, saying: "I should like to have our old hands return to work, and are ready and willing to give all that may apply of such hands, either singly or in a body employment." (Applause.) There is his letter written to the Cigarmakers' Union, showing that the Cigarmakers' Union was not crushed even though the S. T. & L. A. men did, under the guidance of some of the New York, walk in and take the places of the union men who

*In order to make out that the Alliance "grabbed" it at Davis's expense, Mr. De Leon that Davis's name was "open" shop. It was necessary for Harriman to make out that Davis's was an International Union shop, under agreement or contract between Davis and the International Union, thus making the International Union with rights and duties there. Mr. Harriman declares that job, and how? He reads in a carded way passages from Davis's affidavit on the subject of an agreement, which Davis had entered into when Mr. Harriman reaches that point he says: "Mark you that—AN AGREEMENT WITH THE UNION." Not a word, either read from or interpreted into the affidavit, showing that the agreement was with the International Union. Now, then, that agreement was made by Davis expressly with his workers individually, and it expressly excludes all union intervention, international or otherwise. Here is a passage of that agreement pointedly saying so: "That if one or more of our employees are being at any time coerced or otherwise, in order to cause them against their own free will and judgment, join any one or certain labor unions, we shall consider that act as against our interests and not in accordance with the promise or understanding of our list of prices shall thereupon be made to cease to exist and be void." Most significant in this connection, is the fact that the said agreement forms part of the affidavit made by Rosenfeld, the president of the Joint Body Board of the International Union, in opposing Davis's affidavit for an injunction, and that the said Rosenfeld affidavit was part of the rolls of paper from which Mr. Harriman was reading. All the affidavits on file in the office of the county clerk.

In this passage the three-card monte game of Mr. Harriman related to

The thing to do, then, is for the Socialists in each state to get together in their respective states and use their dues for a propaganda for Socialism, and not waste them on good-for-nothing national boards. The 500,000 middle-of-the-road "Populists of the South will never consent to join a party that has the name of 'democratic' attached to it—E." R. Gordon in Nebraska Socialist.

WEEKLY PEOPLE.

Published by the Socialist Labor Party,
at 24 and 6 New Reade St.,
New York.

P.O. Box 1578, Telephone 129 Franklin.
EVERY SATURDAY.

TERMS TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Invariably in advance

Single Copy..... 25
Six months..... \$2
One year..... \$3.50

Bundle rates: Less than 100 copies, 1 cent a copy; 100 to 500 copies, 1/2 cent a copy; 500 or more, 1/4 cent a copy.

As far as possible, rejected communications will be returned if so desired and stamps are enclosed.

Entered as second class matter at the New York Post Office, June 27, 1900.

SOCIALIST VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES.

In 1888 (Presidential)..... 2,069
In 1890..... 13,331
In 1892 (Presidential)..... 21,157
In 1894..... 83,133
In 1896 (Presidential)..... 36,564
In 1898..... 82,204
In 1899..... 85,231



We have belied a few industrial lepers, and we shall bell more before the year is out. The party has in reality cut its wisdom teeth, and the wisdom teeth have cut a few fingers that were where they should not be.

FRANK MACDONALD.

This issue contains a verbatim stenographic report of the debate on Trade Unionism that took place last Sunday in New Haven, Ct., between a representative of the Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance, or New Trade Unionism, and a representative of Pure and Simple, or O.A. Style Trade Unionism.

No serious man, engaged in the Labor Movement, can afford to leave this report unread and unstudied.

The presentation, though narrowed into a two hours' debate, is complete. It places clearly the main, necessary attitude of the Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance, together with the history of Unionism back of it, and it portrays to perfection both the imbecility of its adversaries and the fraudulency of their posture.

The debate furnishes the completest photograph yet produced of the Trades Union Issue. By bringing both sides in juxtaposition, each supplements the other, and both are best understood.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Never yet has the annual performance, known as the "President's Message," reached the depth or the height of hypocrisy that did McKinley's message, read the other day before Congress. One is accustomed to hear rehearsed in these performances the trite phrases about the country's grandeur, the liberty of our people, the happiness of our working class, the industry of our idle or Capitalist Class;—to all this one has grown accustomed, attaching no more importance to it than to the commonplace of civility that are uttered even among people on unfriendly terms. But yesterday's performance outdoes all that has hitherto been done of late upon this line.

The President's message rightly gives the right of way to operations in China and the Philippine Islands. And yet, after opening with two such points, that mark a complete subversion of the country's policy, the message brazenly closes with this passage:

"Our growing power brings with it temptations and perils requiring constant vigilance to avoid. It must not be used to invite conflicts nor for oppression, but for the more effective maintenance of those principles of equality and justice upon which our institutions and happiness depend. Let us keep always in mind that the foundation of our government is liberty; its superstructure peace."

The serving of the devil in God's livery has many exemplifications; never yet, however, was the vile performance exhibited in such unblushing style, upon such an elevated stage, or by so exalted an actor.

To the tune of pretending to warn against the "abuse of power," the national invasion of two distant and weak peoples is commended; to the tune of avoiding deeds of oppression, military operations are favored, intended only to subjugate unwilling nations; to the tune of peace, the war-drum is beaten; to the tune of liberty the chains of vassalage are forged! Non in this all. To the tune of "justice," our products are to be rammed down the throats of unwilling purchasers; to the tune of "our happiness," broad fields are to be opened, whence the already overstocked Labor

Market at home will be swelled by millions of additional competitors; to the tune of "equality," the foundation is laid to intensify the economic inequality that already plagues us at home!

The "President's Message" having reached this notch, what dizzy height of perfidy can be henceforth expected from that quarter?

THEY SCENT EACH OTHER.

Mr. Robert Fulton Cutting, president of the Citizens' Union, issued last Wednesday a political proclamation. In it occurs this passage:

"France has recently given us a splendid object-lesson of unselfish public spirit exhibited in an extraordinary coalition. When the nation was trembling on the brink of the abyss of military despotism, a republican lawyer, a Royalist general, and a leading Socialist united to save the state, and their splendid initiative created a patriotic revival strong enough to accomplish the purpose. When we are ready to follow their example and to add a positive programme to united front, the redemption of the city will be easy. If we would win response, we must discard the trifling expedient of endeavoring to arouse public sentiment by appealing to the tax rate, and have our call to arms upon broad progressive grounds. What the people demand is not retrenchment, but growth; not reform, but progress. Discarding our negative issues, the anti-imperial, anti-silver, anti-trust, yes, even anti-boss, we must adopt a great positive programme, 'pro bono publico.'"

Who will henceforth deny the existence of a strong elective affinity in social and political movements, as well as among chemical substances?

Millerand, claiming to be a Socialist, accepts a job at the hands of Premier Waldeck-Rousseau, a capitalist; and forthwith proceeds to earn his spurs as just the kind of Socialist fit too, for the distinction of a seat in a capitalist cabinet, by taking his share of responsibility for, thereby approving, the conduct of the cabinet in shooting down workingmen on strike. Mr. Robert Fulton Cutting, a gentleman, whose tenement houses on Cherry street were in such condition that even the Board of Health could not stand them, and had to order them torn down as a menace and nuisance—these two worthies scent each other across the ocean, and coalesce.

"Pro bono publico" means different things in different months. By its fruit a tree is known. So, likewise, is the "publico," that is meant each time, ascertained by those from whose mouths it drops. With a Millerand, the "public" whose welfare is sought, can surely not be the workingmen, who, seeking higher wages, are shot down at the command or with the consent of the cabinet. With a Robert Fulton Cutting, the public whose welfare is to be sought can assuredly not be the workers for whom squalid tenements are provided and from whom the rent is extorted for such unsanitary quarters. The "public" with both gentlemen can only mean and be the idle class of capitalism, the brigand class that fleeces the workers.

And that is all it means. We are living in the days of capitalism, and there are just two nations in which capitalism may be properly studied. They are America and France. Other countries may have reached a high capitalist development in industry, but their forms of government still savor of the feudal and thus preserve some principles of self-respect. In America and France alone, the breath of capitalism has invaded the government as well as the shop. Accordingly, in these two nations alone is the phenomenon of the chicanery, practiced by the capitalist in the shop, visible in his political dealings also. The counterpart of the adulteration of goods, practiced by the capitalist in production, is the adulteration of political issues, practiced by the capitalist in government. Thus it happens that capitalism in France and America adulterates its political issues. Instead of bluntly stating what it stands for it conceals itself behind expressions that are in public favor. Thus it happens that an idler and raw-boned fleecer of the workers in America, like Robert Fulton Cutting, falls in line with the modern French capitalist governmental trick, "Socialism" becomes a dear word with him, and "pro bono publico" a first rate ingredient to foist his shoddy political product upon the public.

These are the days that crave wary political walking. Never was it more important than now to look behind phrases and ascertain facts. As a Cutting in America scents across the waters a Millerand in France, recognizes his kin, and adopts his methods, so, likewise, must the working class of America recognize its kin in the well-drilled, class-conscious hosts of the French Socialist Labor Party (Parti Ouvrier Français), and stand alert as stands this French organization.

PRINCIPLE VS. FLY-PAPER.

Eugene V. Debs did not draw as well as we expected. Sure it is, however, that he drew more votes than any other candidate, whom our party could have set up.—Milwaukee, Wis., "Warheit" (Social Democrat).

Correct! The admissions herein contained, tho' tardy, loses none of its weight.

Which is why, we say, and our lan-

guage is plain, that, whatever the poll of the Social Democracy, that vote was not given to a principle, least of all to Socialism; and, what is more, that, in setting up Mr. Debs, his "party" looked not to principle; it looked to votes; and, in order to catch these, it was guided in its choice of candidate by his fly-paper qualities exclusively.

No one, approximately posted on current events, is for a moment deceived upon the Social Democracy. Its organization is known to be made up of the flotsam and jetsam of "reform" and kindred movements that have periodically sprung up in the land for the last twenty years or more, together with a goodly sprinkling of vicious schemers who found the Socialist Labor Party too "narrow" and too "intolerant" to be practiced upon, and were fired out. The organization of this concern—split up from its inception under two hostile headquarters—clearly patented the material it was made of. The circumstance that, despite this glaring evidence of absence of principle and of freking ambition, it claimed to be the "United Socialists," added light to this leading feature of the concern.

The individuals who compose such a body have but one common point of contact. That is, the Scheme; the more or less unalloyed Scheme. To encompass their Schemes they must have a big vote. Accordingly they "pool" their issues," and, as a result of all this, the standard bearers they set up must partake of fly-paper qualities.

Mr. Debs was expected to fill the bill admirably. He was "lovely,"—the sentimentalists were expected to vote for him. He was a "martyr,"—the glibbule were expected to vote for him. He was recitatively poetic,—the dreamers were expected to plump their votes for him. He was "all things to all men,"—the unwary were expected to be corralled wholesale at the hustings. Socialism was the last thing considered. With all these fly-paper qualities, Mr. Debs distanced all competitors in the race, and got the nomination. He was expected to "run" like a racer. "At least one million votes!" exclaimed his train carriers, now his pall-bearers, and they meant "at least two millions!" Indeed, they needed them. Small votes no longer suffice for schemers. No wonder the actual vote—considerably below 100,000—has chilled the schemers' ardor (read expectations).

With the wrangle now going on among the schemers, as betrayed by the quotation that heads this article, we have no concern. Let one set claim they had a better fly-paper candidate, and another set give the fly-paper palm to Debs. What interests the country is the proof, gleaned at this election, that fly-paper candidates have lost their drawing power. The country is growing wise. The flies are growing appallingly few.

To PRINCIPLE, not FLY-PAPER, is the future reserved. Like Truth, PRINCIPLE may gain ground slowly, but it gains ground, and ultimately wears away; FLY-PAPER, on the contrary, wears out speedily, and is cast into the ash barrel of Time.

"WE THE PEOPLE" DWINDLINGLY "UNITING."

Recent reports from Chicago are tart reading. They tell of "all day mass meetings" held by all the Socialist forces for the purpose of "uniting," and leading the "united people" in a triumphant municipal campaign to be opened right away, if not sooner. These events awaken timely reminiscences. In being awakened, the reminiscences incidentally cast valuable, betrayal light upon the Social Democratic vote in Chicago last November 6.

It was late in the summer of '94. The "people" ("leading Socialists" were said to be prominent among them), had just behind them the presidential campaign of '92. In that year the leader of the "people" (the "leading Socialist" included), had polled 22,207 votes in Illinois, of which 1,614 had been contributed by Cook County (Chicago). This was not much of a popular showing for the "people," but it was something.

When the latter part of the summer of '94 have in sight, the "people," the "united people," among them, of course, the inevitable "Socialist luminaries and forces," foregathered again. They were to make a second effort. The occasion was considered most favorable. The American Railway Union, with Mr. Debs as the leader and martyr, had just had its great strike, which the Federal troops and the courts had smashed. Chicago had been the theater of the affair. If sentiment could weld the "people," "all classes," the "Socialist leaders and forces" together—that was the time. One Randolph was set up for State Treasurer,—and off the "united unitednesses" started. Particularly active was the campaign in Chicago. On one occasion, one of the inevitable "Socialist leaders," and a "force" in himself,—a gentleman whose anatomy, drooping eye-lid and inflated paunch, forcibly recalls the frog in the fable that exploded in the attempt to blow himself into the size of an ox—put a trumpet to his mouth,

and addressed a large meeting with the words, "We are the people." Election day came and the Weaver vote was nearly tripled in the State. Randolph polled 59,738 votes, towards which Cook county alone contributed 33,908. There was disappointment. A much larger vote was expected. The "united people" did not seem to flock excessively. But there was consolation in the thought that Socialist Labor Party had never reached that notch.

The third stage in the development was a painful experience—to the visionaries. It was two years later. The "united people" were wiped out. Bryan absorbed them taking Debs along with him. Above the wreck there remained only the Socialist Labor Party, with a small vote of 1,147, it is true, yet firm and unperturbed.

The fourth stage was reached last campaign. The "harmonizers" again pulled together. All sorts of excuses were given for the melting away of the "unitednesses" four years ago, and a number of reasons were given why: this trip, the showing of the "united people" would be tremendous: In the first place, Debs himself was running; that meant a start, in Chicago alone, with the 33,908 votes of '94. In the second place, the "Socialists were united," the S. L. P. being said to have fused with the Social Democracy. (This was said without a blush.) In the third place, the Republican papers were booming Debs for all they were worth, puffing up his prospective vote. Upon all these grounds, the "united forces" felt confident. Election day made them all feel and look as if they had chills and fever. The Debs vote in all Illinois was only 9,672,—more than 24,000 less than the "united people's" vote of '94 in Cook county and over 50,000 votes less than in the whole State!

The performance now reported as taking place in Chicago to "unite" once more, and once more gather the "whole people," may be understood by the light of the above antecedents. Nor do the performers fail to contribute their gleams to appreciate such performances. There is not unity of forces possible—at least not for serious and honorable results—with phrases as a basis. The nucleus for any unity worth the name, in Chicago as elsewhere, is the soundly poised, intrepid and unflinching Socialist Labor Party. Whoever, whatever fits there is unstable,—and will eventually be united; whatever does not fit there is UN-unstable, and all glue phrases to the contrary, notwithstanding, will never gather but to scatter.

Rainbow-chasing can never start from solid ground; neither can rainbow-chasers ever hold together.

DEATH-BED CONSULTATIONS. It has passed into a proverb that special sessions of Congress denote a weak administration. When an administration is strong, when it feels itself safe in the saddle, it can afford to wait for the regular time when Congress convenes. When, on the contrary, the administration feels the ground under it shaky, and does not rely upon its own nerve, then it needs Congress to lean upon, to throw at least part of the responsibility on, and to put things into shape. Such an administration hastens to convene Congress in special session. In a country where, like this, government is by party, the conduct of parties reflects the motives that guide government itself. What is going on now among the "minor parties" is, accordingly, of no minor importance. One may judge their sense of safety, their sense of conscious ascendancy by their own conduct.

Among the minor parties the Prohibition party may be ignored from the start. It is in no way a child of our American social or political life. It is a political abortion, a cross between Bible misquotations and capitalist hypocrisy. There remain the Socialist Labor Party, the Social Democracy, with headquarters in Chicago, the Social Democracy, with headquarters in Springfield, Mass., the Populist Party, the Silver Republicans, and the Middle-of-the-Roaders. How are these conducting themselves? With a single exception, they are all calling for special conventions.—Both wings of the Social Democracy, the Populists, the Silver Republicans, the Middle-of-the-Roaders, each of them, while boasting of "great success," gives the evidence of great shakiness in its anxiety for a national convention, to be held as soon as possible, if not sooner.

The exception to this tell-tale behavior on the part of the minor parties is the Socialist Labor Party. It alone is not bothering about special national conventions. Like administrations that feel perfectly safe and strong, and that, consequently, care not to convene Congress in special session, but abide the regular time, the Socialist Labor Party serenely pursues its course; it does not indulge in hysterics; its conventions are left to occur in the regular order; and, in the meantime, it carries on its work, uninterrupted.

The Socialist Labor Party is severe and intolerant,—as severe and intolerant as science. It stands, consequently, for the only methods that can bring that about, to-wit, the uncompromising warfare upon the capitalist class conducted upon the clean-cut interests of the working class.

Such a warfare excludes all "sugar-coatings"; it excludes all sugar-coating; it excludes all trimming,—and along with that excludes the intellectually "knock-kneed" to whom the erect posture of manhood is as impossible as it is incomprehensible.

'Tis not the votes cast or polled; 'tis

not the claims made; 'tis not the oratory and declamations indulged in that serve as a test of a political body's confidence in itself. The test is the principles on which it stands, the tactics that it pursues, the character of its organization. And among the manifestations of this test is the body's conduct after the battle. The nervous craving for conventions, manifested by all these minor parties, except the Socialist Labor Party, immediately after election betrays the fact that one and all lack confidence in themselves. And well they may. Neither their principles nor their tactics nor yet the character of their organization is of a nature to inspire them with confidence. Feeling the ground shaky under them each wants company. Hence that noverlest of sights, several of them wanting to hold conventions in common!

While the "United (?) Socialists (?) and kindred reformers, who are looking for short-cuts across lots, are losing themselves in the woods and seek to keep themselves in countenance by wild halloos, the Socialist Labor Party looks down at the set and wonders how long it will be before these would-be teachers of the people will themselves learn the A B C's of the Social Question.

EXPLOITING BLUNDERS.

The following squib occurs in the New York "Evening Post":

"By actual experience the Ruskinites, a colony of Socialists, which was transported some time ago from Tennessee to a site near Waycross, Ga., have demonstrated what is probably the lowest possible daily cost for food. They live at an actual cost per capita of less than ten cents a day."

Time and again level people have risen and lectured the Socialist Labor Party on its severity and intolerance. These lectures were especially reproachful on the subject of the Party's attitude towards the so-called co-operative colonies, the Ruskin colony among the rest. The above squib, published in a capitalist paper—a "rifle-diet to the workers" paper—should serve as an ample justification to the Party's attitude.

Colonies are actual denials of Socialism: Socialism is banked upon integral co-operation,—Colonies build upon a basis so narrow that their co-operation is a caricature of the term; Socialism builds upon collective work and individual living,—Colonies build upon collective living; Socialism builds upon full enjoyment of material and intellectual wealth, an enjoyment abreast of the racial needs of the Nineteenth Century,—Colonies, as the above passage succinctly imputes to Socialism, build upon stunted enjoyment of material and intellectual wealth, an enjoyment far behind that of the present racial needs, and resembling that of the days of the infancy of the race.

The first two points have been frequently taken up in these columns. The third may as well be dealt with now.

It is a feature of sentimental Socialism to make the "cheap John" argument. Every one who approaches Socialism, not from the class struggle side, but from the sentimental side; not from the practical side of production, but from the bourgeois side of consumption;—every such person inevitably slides back and down into a position where, instead of aiding, he hampers Socialist thought; instead of weakening, he strengthens the arm of the spokesmen of Capitalism.

At this season, when the conquest of distant lands with cheap labor is being accompanied at home with articles of how cheaply man can live; at this season, the coolie condition to which the Ruskin colony reduces its colonists can only serve to strengthen the Atkinson School of Starvation. The capitalist carves not how he contradicts himself. On one side, he argues that the workingmen are too luxurious; and then he proceeds to prove with Atkinsonian cooking stoves and "Journal" game-reporters on how little man can "live, love and enjoy life." On the other hand, he will use illustrations of bogus Socialism, such as the Ruskinites furnish, in order to discredit Socialism by giving it a coolie appearance.

The Socialist Labor Party is severe and intolerant,—as severe and intolerant as science. It stands, consequently, for the only methods that can bring that about, to-wit, the uncompromising warfare upon the capitalist class conducted upon the clean-cut interests of the working class.

Such a warfare excludes all "sugar-coatings"; it excludes all sugar-coating; it excludes all trimming,—and along with that excludes the intellectually "knock-kneed" to whom the erect posture of manhood is as impossible as it is incomprehensible.



Uncle Sam and Brother Jonathan

BROTHER JONATHAN.—No you know anything about the Socialists and Socialism?

UNCLE SAM.—Some.

B. J.—Well, I think they ought to be strung up by the heels. Don't you?

U. S.—Jumping back, startled!—Why? How you talk!

B. J.—(Puckering up his brows and looking very tragic)—Why? I'll tell ye why. Because their program would tear up society by the roots; it would build up the family; it would deprive man of all incentive to provide for and raise his children—

U. S.—Why, that WOULD be very dreadful. But how do you make all that out?

B. J.—I'll explain it to you. I got it straight from a College Professor—

U. S.—Bursts out laughing.

B. J.—You will laugh the wrong side of your mouth if you listen to me. That College Professor explained that under Socialism, if you and I owned a railroad, for instance—

U. S.—The devil take your instance! Do you and I own any railroads?

B. J.—No; but listen. If we did; supposing we did, that railroad would become common property. The new owners would have to pay their fare as well as others; they could not live on its income; and—

U. S.—Well, what at that?

B. J.—(Impatiently)—Just wait, can't you? The worst is yet to come.

U. S.—May the heavens have mercy!

B. J.—Yes; there is worse coming. If the capital that a father gathers is not sure to go to his children, but is sure to be taken away from them, what incentive would there be to work? Such a plan is heinous! It is dastardly! It is criminal! (Almost sobbing.) It is—it is—it is utterly un-American!!! (Mops the sweat off his brow.)

U. S.—Looks him over meditatively.—Guess I understand you.

B. J.—You do?

U. S.—Yes. Your point is that Socialism would interfere with inheritance.

B. J.—That's it!

U. S.—That what a father has gathered to himself belongs to his children, after he is dead.

B. J.—That's what I mean.

U. S.—And to his children's children?

B. J.—Down to the last generation.

U. S.—And that the taking of any such thing away from such children is so heinous, dastardly and criminal as to be utterly un-American.

B. J.—Absolutely un-American and not to be tolerated.

U. S.—Was Washington an American?

B. J.—A grand specimen of one!

U. S.—And Franklin?

B. J.—Oh, he was American with a vengeance!

U. S.—And Jefferson?

B. J.—There was a pink of Americanism!

U. S.—What they did, was that good or bad? American or un-American?

B. J.—Their conduct was animated by the truest American sentiments of right and justice.

U. S.—So say I. Well, these three and all our Revolutionary Fathers, that very thing that you are condemning as "heinous," "dastardly," "criminal," in short, "un-American."

B. J.—(Flaring up).—Not much, they didn't!

U. S.—Didn't King George own these colonies?

B. J.—What of it? Yes.

U. S.—Hadn't he inherited them from his ancestors, and hadn't these grabbed this territory and virtually pocketed and run it to suit themselves.

B. J.—Yes.

U. S.—Well, if it is "heinous," "dastardly," "criminal" and "un-American" to prevent that which a father owns from passing to his children so that they can enjoy it, then it certainly was heinous as heinous could be, dastardly and criminal as dastardly and criminal could be, in short, as utterly un-American as un-American could be, to deprive King George of what had been handed down to him by his ancestors, and keeping his offspring from it. Now, then, my fatty, on which horn of the dilemma will you impale yourself? Were our Revolutionary Fathers un-American, or is Socialism American up to the handle? Which?

B. J.—Throws up his arms with an impatient and deprecating gesture).—That's just like you. Always giving a twist to the discussion so as to make a fellow look ridiculous to himself—

U. S.—Glad you feel that way.

B. J.—But for all that, your comparison does not hold. The two cases are not alike. King George tried to misuse his inheritance. He tried to tyrannize us by virtue of the ownership of that which his father had left to him. Under such circumstances, one has a right, one has a duty, to yank that inheritance out of his hands.

U. S.—You now amend your original proposition. Originally it was a sweeping condemnation as un-American of the act of depriving people of what their

fathers held; now the proposition is that such an act is un-American when the property is not wrongfully but that if the property is wrongfully used, it is the height of Americanism those who suffer thereby to yank it out of the rascal.

B. J.—I'll accept it that way.

U. S.—And I shall now show you the capital which capitalist fathers have used by them to tyrannize our people worse than King George did.

B. J.—It is?

U. S.—Have you any capital?

B. J.—Nixy.

U. S.—But you have a stomach and your wife and your children (now these must be filled).

B. J.—(Sadly shaking his head).—My wages don't enable me to do it.

U. S.—And yet you have arms and skill. Why don't you go ahead and produce shoes for yourself instead of for your employers?

B. J.—Because I have no capital, I can't work without the machinery and needed to make shoes.

U. S.—And you keep all the shoe that you produce or their value?

B. J.—You disgust me! Why, no! I don't keep the value of one shoe out of every four that I turn out.

U. S.—Are you robbed out of the fourth of your produce?

B. J.—That's about the size of it.

U. S.—And you like to be robbed, do you feel constrained to submit to robbery, and be kept dependent upon your employer by virtue of his very ownership of what he either got from his father, or gathered himself, and would like to transmit to his children?

B. J.—Makes a motion with his right leg as tho' he were kicking at something.

U. S.—That College Professor whom you heard libeling Socialism as so as to deceive the people may one of these days be himself the one to be strung up, same as the traitor Tories, who tried to spy on the Revolutionary Army.

U. S.—And you like to be robbed, do you feel constrained to submit to robbery, and be kept dependent upon your employer by virtue of his very ownership of what he either got from his father, or gathered himself, and would like to transmit to his children?

B. J.—Makes a motion with his right leg as tho' he were kicking at something.

U. S.—That College Professor whom you heard libeling Socialism as so as to deceive the people may one of these days be himself the one to be strung up, same as the traitor Tories, who tried to spy on the Revolutionary Army.

U. S.—And you like to be robbed, do you feel constrained to submit to robbery, and be kept dependent upon your employer by virtue of his very ownership of what he either got from his father, or gathered himself, and would like to transmit to his children?

B. J.—Makes a motion with his right leg as tho' he were kicking at something.

U. S.—That College Professor whom you heard libeling Socialism as so as to deceive the people may one of these days be himself the one to be strung up, same as the traitor Tories, who tried to spy on the Revolutionary Army.

U. S.—And you like to be robbed, do you feel constrained to submit to robbery, and be kept dependent upon your employer by virtue of his very ownership of what he either got from his father, or gathered himself, and would like to transmit to his children?

B. J.—Makes a motion with his right leg as tho' he were kicking at something.

U. S.—That College Professor whom you heard libeling Socialism as so as to deceive the people may one of these days be himself the one to be strung up, same as the traitor Tories, who tried to spy on the Revolutionary Army.

U. S.—And you like to be robbed, do you feel constrained to submit to robbery, and be kept dependent upon your employer by virtue of his very ownership of what he either got from his father, or gathered himself, and would like to transmit to his children?

OFFICIAL NOTICES.

National Executive Committee.

The regular meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Labor Party was held at the Daily People Building, Monday evening, December 3.

Forbes in the chair.

Receipts for the week, \$39.58; expenditures \$10.08.

Organizer Abelson of Section New York reported the following vote for nominations for the National Executive Committee:

Peter Fieldman	329
Julius Hammer	342
Eber Fildes	332
August Gudmund	330
John T. Kennedy	315
Rudolph Katz	307
Adolph Klein	296
Bernard O'Toole	291
Charles G. Teich	281
Timothy Walsh	277
Herman Weinstein	273
Adam Moros	267
William Kelly	211
Joseph Shourer	209
Dow Hoffman	195
Stephen Mumery	181
William F. H. B.	178

The National Secretary was instructed to have ballots printed to be sent to the Sections of the Party in accordance with Article V, Section 1, of the Constitution. Section Baltimore reports the expulsion of William Mark for voting the Republican ticket.

National Organizer Peppin reported on his work in Illinois.

National Organizer Dalton reported on his work in the State of New York.

Interesting reports continue to reach headquarters relative to the way the pure and simple kept their agreement to vote for Debs. Last week it was \$1. Louis that gave an interesting morsel; this week it is Texas, as the following extract from a San Antonio letter will indicate:

"In Texas, as everywhere else, the Debsists got badly left. Here they had a paper of their own—the Farmer's Review, they took into the fold every week that professed to be radically inclined; they favored on the pure and simple, and counted the erstwhile Populists or radical Democrats; and their claims before election—forty thousand at least, and a hundred thousand would not have surprised them. In San Antonio, where the laboring workers had all pledged themselves to vote for Debs, and there are 200 of them, as well as many more pure and simple, Debs got 147 votes.

As to the rigid, strict, uncompromising, persevering spirit of the S. L. P., the following brief letter from the Secretary of the Washington State Committee is self-explanatory. It is but one of hundreds that reach the National Executive Committee:

"We have at least made a slight increase in spite of the Debsian annex to capitalist parties, in spite of their treacherous attempt to divide the working class by a fake ticket. They brag: 'We have more votes than you.' Certainly they have. So have the other enemies of the wage workers, the Demo-Repulic parties with their Bryans and McKinkleys. That is why we are. It is our work to overcome all fake parties and force the enemy, with their flunkies and lackies following, into one camp. But in spite of the fact that they have fought us hard, they have not realized their boast that they would kill the S. L. P. In spite of the fact that they shook the earth with the blatant yap of Bill the Noisy from Windy Nebraska and baited their line with the Debsomania from Indiana, they have no more than kept us from getting what was NOT ours—we have the Socialist vote; they caught the freaks. We know now what we have to fight. Watch our banner from this time on. Live the Revolution!"

Sections are again urgently requested to return campaign subscription lists. Send the list to the State Committee. Sections in States where there are no State Committees are to return the lists to the National Secretary.

JULIAN PIERCE, Recording Sec.

Massachusetts State Committee.

The members elected to the Socialist Labor Party State Committee of 1901 are hereby called to meet, for the purpose of legally organizing, on Saturday, January 5, 1901, at the headquarters of the Socialist Labor Party, 45 Elliot street, Boston at 7.35 p. m. The following districts have held Senatorial conventions and elected State committee-men: first and second Bristol, first Plymouth, first Suffolk, first, second, fourth and fifth Essex, third, fourth and fifth Middlesex, Middlesex and Essex, and second Hampden. Caucuses were held in the second Middlesex District, but the Secretary has received no notice of a Senatorial convention being held there. The Secretary will send credentials to the State committee-man for that district as soon as he gets the name and address. The State convention held September 4, 1900, elected ten members as members at large of the State committee of 1901. These are also notified to attend.

Sections and members at large in Senatorial districts where no caucuses were held are requested to send to the undersigned or to Alfred E. Jones, 200 Bradford street, Everett, the name of a loyal comrade in their district for State committee-man. The State Committee will, as soon as organized, appoint those comrades to fill the vacancies.

J. O'HEILLY, Secretary.

Socialist Ticket in Cambridge, Mass.

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., Dec. 3.—The Socialist Labor Party of this city, at a convention held on November 27, decided, for the second time in its history, to enter the municipal campaign. A complete city ticket was accordingly nominated, as follows:

For Mayor, J. W. Daehman.

For Aldermen, Ward Five, Ed. A. Chester, William E. Stacey.

For Alderman-at-large, Ward Five, Sils T. Fuglestock.

Ward Two, Christian Beck.

Ward Three, Gustave A. Blaschke.

COMMON COUNCIL.

Ward Two, Oscar A. Blangquist.

Ward Three, William J. Sullivan.

It is confidently believed that a large vote will be cast for this ticket. This belief is based on the vote of last year, when our candidate for alderman in one ward polled over 1,100 votes. Every indication favors an increase over this vote this year.

Woburn S. L. P. Nominations

WOBURN, Mass., Nov. 29.—The Socialist Labor Party of Woburn, at its Municipal convention, of which Peter Nelson was chairman and John Daley secretary, for Mayor, John P. Bradley.

Board of Public Works, John W. Kegan.

Aldermen-at-large, John O'Donnell, Cornelius J. O'Brien, John A. Johnson, James L. McDermott, Joseph V. Schugel, and William H. O'Brien.

S. L. P. Nominations in Lynn.

LYNN, Mass., Nov. 29.—Lynn Section, S. L. P., has nominated the following ticket for the Municipal election: Mayor, Frank Keefe; Assessor, John P. Coyle; School Committee, Herbert R. Manley, Daniel S. Law, Aldermen: Ward 3, George R. Pearce; Ward 4, John Bailey and Michael D. Fitzgerald; Ward 5, Michael Crotty and James Goodwin; Ward 6, Thomas Cashman and Charles N. Wentworth; Ward 7, Charles Salm. Common Council: Ward 3, Oscar E. Morse; Ward 4, James J. Travers; John O'Donnell, John Hickey, Frank B. Jordan and John Henley; Ward 5, David W. Shaw; Ward 6, Walter Deans and Owen Hughes; Ward 7, Thomas M. Birtwell.

Section Lynn's Officers for Next Term.

LYNN, Mass., Dec. 3.—Section Lynn, S. L. P., at its regular meeting on the above date elected the following officers for the first six months of 1901:

Organizer, Francis Ambrose Walsh, 384 Boston street, Lynn, Mass.

Recording and corresponding secretary, John Ryan.

Financial secretary, Thomas Burtwell.

Treasurer, Gallagher.

Press committee, Hughes, Walsh and Burtwell.

Grievance committee, Hughes Coyle and Deans.

Official Notice.

CLEVELAND, O., Nov. 29.—Section Cleveland, of the Socialist Labor Party, will hold a convention on Sunday, Dec. 9th, 2.30 p. m., at Party Headquarters, 256 Ontario street, for the purpose of nominating candidates for the different offices to be filled at the Municipal election next April.

All Party members are hereby earnestly requested to be present.

The branches in the various districts are requested to make nominations for the City Council at their next regular meeting.

By order of the General Committee of Section Cleveland, S. L. P.,

FRANK ERBEN, Organizer.

108 Starkweather avenue.

Donations to the Daily People.

(Week ending Nov. 24.)

Previously acknowledged \$2,533.85

Milwaukee, Wis., Huber 40c.

Schuster \$1, Kloth 40c, Vierthaler \$2, Fuhr 40c, Schmidt 40c, Rubinger 40c, Schmette 40c, Schnable 20c, Schlenker 40c, Wilke \$2.

Schenectady, N.Y., E. L. Lake \$1, E. F. L. Lake \$1, Weinberger \$1, Clubs 1 to 4 \$1 each, \$4.

Elizabeth, N. J., Hoffman 45c, McGarry 25c, May 50c, Kuncold 25c, Sauer 25c, Fruth 25c, Hansen 25c, Press 25c, Koerner 25c, Jentracck 15c, Wagner 25c, Hueb 25c, Peterson 25c, Seromovsky 25c.

Waterbury, Conn., J. Arela \$1.

Jacksonville, Ill., Renner 50c.

Morris 50c, Lacey 50c, Hoffman 50c.

San Antonio, Tex., Bowers 25c.

Lietner 25c, Pollard 50c, Liedner 50c.

Cleveland, Ohio, Alzuhn 25c.

Klien 25c, Zimmer 50c, Kubanek \$1.

St. Louis, Mo., Heitzig \$8; Wiperman \$8; Danzaker \$3.

New Haven, Conn., Serrer 50c; Pfirman 50c; Sohey 50c; Marx 50c; Stedol 50c; Maher 50; Feldman 25c.

Plainfield, N. J., By Branch \$2.

Essex County, N. J., Owen \$2.50; Newey \$1; Waltz 25c; Vogel 25c; Duggan 25c.

Hoboken, N. J., J. Sweeney 50c.

Jersey City, N. J., E. F. Wegener \$1.

Union Hill, N. J., Shepps 10c; Fricke 10c; Becker 10c; Thammel 10c; Betsch 10c; Dietrich 5c; Weibert 10c; G. E. 25 c; C. L. 25c; Rome 25c; for subsequent week \$1.45.

Richmond County, N. Y., Snyder \$1; Clark 50c; Driscoll \$1.

New York—Excelsior Literary Society \$1.

6th and 10th A. D. Schener \$1; Weisslowitch \$50; Humvitz \$1.

13th A. D., Gruenwald \$1; Haller \$1; Oest 50c.

15th and 17th A. D., O'Toole \$1; Cokerove \$1.

16th A. D., a friend, 25c; Weinberger, 25c; Gocheris, 25c; Gocheris, 25c; Moskowitz, 25c; Gottlieb, 25c; Lefkowitz, 25c; Bodenstein, 25c; Bear, 25c; Herszkowicz, \$1; Henchel 25c; Stark, 25c; Fuerman, \$1; Friedman, 25c; Wolf, 25c; Pfanzner, 25c; Wohl, 25c; Feldman, 25c; Lederman, 50c; Roritz, 50c.

18th A. D., per Owen Diamond 25th A. D., S. Wimmer \$3.

19th and 21st A. Ds., Mitchell 50c; Mahland, 40c; Eller, 50c; Brandes, 50c; Orlicke, 50c; Douai, 50c; Rasmussen, 50c; D. W. G. 50c; Frank, 50c; Rosenkranz, 50c; Wei-

man, 50c; Petersen, 50c; Leiminger, 50c.

23d A. D., Rubin, \$1; Tzemakh, \$1; Plamondon, 50c; Koffman 50c; Busson, 25c; Larsen, 50c; Westergaard, 50c; Pollock, 50c; Bana, 50c.

30th A. D., Gillhaus, 50c; Moren 50c; Samuels, \$1; Heyman, 50c; Klein, 50c; Barthel, 50c.

32nd and 33rd A. D., D. M. Svenson \$2; J. W. \$1.

34th and 35th A. D., Hermansen, 50c; Hodas 25c; Johansen 50; Gajewski 50c; Kinnally 50c; Crawford 50c.

Brooklyn, 7th A. D., W. H. Wherry \$1, B. Wherry \$1.25; Klein \$1.50; Oehlcker \$1, bet won by Oehlcker \$1.

Brooklyn, 13 and 14 A. D., Christiansen 25c, Muntefering 25c, Kuck 25c, Fredericksen 25c, Lochr 20c, Belapolsky 15c.

Brooklyn, 20 A. D., Zoeller 25c, Mueller 50c, Cash 50c, Stegeman 50c, Forbes 50c, Malament 50c.

Total \$2,651.15

HENRY KUHN, National Secretary.

Daily People General Fund.

Previously acknowledged \$14,810.64

Received for Minor Fund from E. J. Morin, Duluth, Minn., 25c; collection at general meeting of Section New York, less rent of hall, \$35.01; Geo. F. Spettel, St. Paul, Minn., \$3; Condersport, Pa., Caussain, \$1; Francois, \$1; Weibel, \$1; Daniel Law, Lynn, Mass., \$1; E. W. White, Polk, Pa., 25c; from dissolved Liedertafel, Buffalo, N. Y., \$5.

Total \$14,858.15

HENRY KUHN, Financial Secretary-Treasurer, Daily People Committee.

General Agitation Fund.

Previously acknowledged \$1,283.04

Minnesota State Committee, on list, 2.50

Section Clinton, Iowa, per J. R. Popin, 3.00

Theo. Zollner, Little Falls, Minn., per J. R. Popin, 1.00

Section Baltimore, Md., per C. H. Corrigan, 6.00

Virginia State Committee, per C. H. Corrigan, 23.00

Section Altoona, Pa., per C. H. Corrigan, 4.00

Section Patton, Pa., per C. H. Corrigan, 6.00

Section Houtzdale, Pa., per C. H. Corrigan, 10.00

Section Dubois, Pa., per C. H. Corrigan, 3.00

23d A. D., N. Y.: one-half on list 608, 6.00

Total \$1,347.54

NOTE.—Sections and State Committees are urged to return lists for this fund without delay; sections in organized States to make returns to their respective State Committees, isolated sections to report to the undersigned.

HENRY KUHN, National Secretary, 2-6 New Reade street, N. Y.

Know What They Want.

Votes may come and votes may go but principles live on forever.

It is far better to have ten men who know what they want and how to get it than to have a hundred who do not know what they want, nor how to avoid getting what they do not want but yet vote for, viz., lenden bread and heavy when on strike.

When the campaign started the 1st, 3d and 5th Assembly Districts had only two active members, now we have eight, and expect to more than double that before next year's campaign is started. We have changed from 261 Hudson street to 407 Canal street, where we meet every Monday night in the large hall. All comrades and sympathizers living or knowing any one living in any of the three districts should send their names and addresses to the secretary, J. Cules, 107 4th avenue, City. We expect before many months have passed to establish a club in one of the districts. Though our vote may fall our membership increases and that is the best sign of a healthy growth that we can wish for.

Fraternally yours

THE SECRETARY.

New York, December 3.

A Good Subject.

Section, Erie county, Pa., hereafter meets every Friday evening, 7.30 sharp, at Guade's Hall, corner of Twelfth street and Peach street. All readers of the WEEKLY PEOPLE are requested to join the section and bring their friends. Next Friday night will be discussion meeting. Subject: Pure and Simple Unionism or Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance Unionism.

Dalton in Troy, N. Y.

TROY, N. Y., Dec. 3.—W. S. Dalton lectured before Socialist Labor Party Section, Troy yesterday, on the subject of Socialist Labor Party Tactics.

The members were well pleased with the clear cut exposition of the speaker, who plainly showed that only by its uncompromising tactics can the Party expect to win the victory over capitalism and its allies of every kind.

The Loren Fund.

SOMERVILLE, Mass., Dec. 4.—Up to date the committee in charge of the Loren fund has received thirty-four dollars (\$34). Acknowledgments in detail will be sent to the DAILY PEOPLE the last of this week.

REPUBLICANS CARRY HAVERTHILL.

As we go to press we receive the following telegram from Havert Hill regarding the Municipal election held there Tuesday, December 4:

Havert Hill, Mass., Dec. 4.

Republicans make clean sweep. Debates up the creek. M. T. BERRY.

Dalton to Speak in Boston.

W. S. Dalton, of Seattle, Wash., will lecture in Caledonia Hall, 45 Elliot street, Boston, Sunday, December 9th, 1900, at 3 p. m.

Subject: The Social Democratic Party. The Socialist Labor Party: Which party truly represents the interests of the Working Class? Tickets 10c.

Comrades of Boston and vicinity should attend this lecture and bring their friends.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

There will be a meeting of Section Milwaukee, Saturday evening, December 8, at Kaiser's Hall, 300 Fourth street. Every comrade should be present as there are several committees that have reports and recommendations ready for this meeting.

FRANK L. WILKE, Org.

Chicago, Ill.

Section Chicago will hold a mass convention Friday, December 7, at 8 p. m., at 48 West Randolph street, for the purpose of nominating candidates for the different offices to be filled at the municipal election to be held next April. Every comrade is earnestly requested to be present.

THOMAS STEIGERWALD, Organizer, 206 Illinois street.

Somerville S. L. P. Ticket.

SOMERVILLE, Mass., Dec. 4.—The candidates of the Socialist Labor Party at the city election to be held December 11 are: For Mayor, T. C. Brophy; Alderman-at-large, Augustus F. Pecheur, of Ward 2; Harold Hellberg of Ward 6; Ward Alderman, Ward 2, Charles A. Johnson; School Committee, Ward 2, Louis H. Pecheur.

The highest vote received by a candidate of the Socialist Labor Party at the State election was 950—for Charles A. Johnson, candidate for Register of Deeds. The Democrats did not nominate.

Notice to S. L. P. & S. T. & L. A. Secretaries.

Secretaries of S. L. P. sections and of local and district alliances connected with the Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance, are requested to communicate matters of general and special industrial interest, such as reports of strikes, boycotts, lock-outs, etc., to the Editor Field of Labor, DAILY PEOPLE, 2-6 New Reade street, New York City.

LETTER BOX.

Off-Hand Answers to Correspondents.

[No questions will be considered that come in anonymous letters. All letters must carry a bona fide signature and address.]

HENRY KUHN, National Secretary, 2-6 New Reade street, N. Y.

Know What They Want.

Votes may come and votes may go but principles live on forever.

It is far better to have ten men who know what they want and how to get it than to have a hundred who do not know what they want, nor how to avoid getting what they do not want but yet vote for, viz., lenden bread and heavy when on strike.

When the campaign started the 1st, 3d and 5th Assembly Districts had only two active members, now we have eight, and expect to more than double that before next year's campaign is started. We have changed from 261 Hudson street to 407 Canal street, where we meet every Monday night in the large hall. All comrades and sympathizers living or knowing any one living in any of the three districts should send their names and addresses to the secretary, J. Cules, 107 4th avenue, City. We expect before many months have passed to establish a club in one of the districts. Though our vote may fall our membership increases and that is the best sign of a healthy growth that we can wish for.

Fraternally yours

THE SECRETARY.

New York, December 3.

A Good Subject.

Section, Erie county, Pa., hereafter meets every Friday evening, 7.30 sharp, at Guade's Hall, corner of Twelfth street and Peach street. All readers of the WEEKLY PEOPLE are requested to join the section and bring their friends. Next Friday night will be discussion meeting. Subject: Pure and Simple Unionism or Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance Unionism.

Dalton in Troy, N. Y.

TROY, N. Y., Dec. 3.—W. S. Dalton lectured before Socialist Labor Party Section, Troy yesterday, on the subject of Socialist Labor Party Tactics.

The members were well pleased with the clear cut exposition of the speaker, who plainly showed that only by its uncompromising tactics can the Party expect to win the victory over capitalism and its allies of every kind.

The Loren Fund.

SOMERVILLE, Mass., Dec. 4.—Up to date the committee in charge of the Loren fund has received thirty-four dollars (\$34). Acknowledgments in detail will be sent to the DAILY PEOPLE the last of this week.

etc., etc., etc. Throw your bread upon the waters and never look for the return.

Never send any poem, whether with stanzas for return or not, if you want it back, or can not patiently abide your name at the head of this page the statement stands printed that rejected communications will be returned—AS FAR AS POSSIBLE. It has become impossible to do this with our kind poets. They are too numerous.

R. D. B., NEW HAVEN, CONN.—Yes, these sick and death benefit "unions," more properly called "comin associations," are very bitter. But you should not wonder. Their horizon is bounded with a coffin. Whoever attacks their abuses concern attacks their coffin. They look upon him as the desecrator of a graveyard. No wonder the dry bones clatter.

"A WAGE SLAVE," SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.—Dr. Ross Malthusianism is no better than any other Malthusianism. Malthusianism is a theory according to which it is a natural, unavoidable law for population to increase beyond the means of subsistence. That "natural," "unavoidable" law has been knocked into a cocked hat. It is "natural" and "unavoidable" only in the sense that it is "natural" and "unavoidable" for people who have not learned how to read, not to be able to read. The development of Science has turned the tables on Malthus. Thanks to inventions and the progress in the technique of production, subsistence increases faster than population.

The instance of the coolies and Japs that he mentions is doubly infelicitous for him. Their poverty is due, not to their fecundity but their backwardness in production.

What, however, constitutes the most blameworthy part of Dr. Ross' lecture is that he places his opposition to coolie and Jap emigration upon the pretence of racial difference. He argues as tho' the lower range of physical wants of the coolies and Japs were a racial distinction. The fact is that these coolies and Japs are but accentuated American workmen. The condition of the former only foreshadows what the American workmen will land, thanks to the jingo obstinacy of the Doctors Ross to resist Socialism.

"HOOPLA," NEW LONDON, CONN.—Your question is best answered with the answer comrade De Leon gave in this office last Monday morning, after the New Haven debate: "I feel as if I have been heaving over a dung cart. I'm going to take a Turkish bath."

P. M., CINCINNATI, O.—Many are the recurring reasons why James O'Connell, "Grand Master of the International Association of Machinists" has been recurring to a fakir in these columns. The latest reason is his present conduct. He is the worst party worker of the S. L. P. among the machinists by making them believe that they have won a victory, whereas their efforts for improved economic conditions have again been thwarted.

J. S., NEW YORK.—I. Economies is the science that teaches the law that underlies production and distribution in society.

2. Political economy covers about the same ground but somewhat extends into the domain of sociology.

3. Sociology is the science that teaches the laws that underlie the development of human society.

4. Economic is the adjective of economic.